# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vo SEPTEMBER, 1920 No. 3

## PRAYER-BOOK REVISION*

Prayer-Book Revision has got far. It has conquered objection to itself on principle. It has passed large proposals through all four Houses of Convocation. The new Lectionary is already too widely used to be recalled. The clergy have scarcely realized that they have only to write to S.P.C.K. for "Report No. 517," which embodies, save for two sections, the whole proposals, else they had doubtless started the use, where they rightly could, of the Revision, or parts of it, experimentally. The new stage of experimental use is indeed hard upon us, and a fresh and interesting process it is. In the writer's own College Chapel at Cambridge much of the Revision is in constant use; and the critics can begin to estimate weakness and strength. Canon Dalton's book represents another type of experiment. He produces a Prayer-Book of his own, embodying and advancing upon that of Convocation. It is helpful to see how easily such a Prayer-Book goes into print, and maintains the familiar look of the old. For preface, he gives a history, valuable and complete, of the revision movement in all its stages. Moreover, in many of the points where he goes beyond the official Revision, his work has qualities, both of common sense and of imagination, which will be suggestive for the future course of revising. For we cannot suppose that the process is likely to stop. The greatest hope about the present Revision is that it has made a beginning. It has so far recovered our liturgical freedom, has made us liturgically a living Church; public worship has by it won back the power to reflect the widest needs and visions of a Catholic communion which is ever gloriously ancient and faithfully new.

* *Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer agreed to at a Conference of Members of the Four Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York.* Report 517. S.P.C.K. 1919. 9d. net.

*The Book of Common Prayer.* An Edition containing Proposals and Suggestions. Compiled by J. N. Dalton, Canon of Windsor. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1920. 30s. net.

*The English Liturgies of* 1549 *and* 1661. Compared with each other and with the Ancient Liturgies. J. N. Field. S.P.C.K. 1920. 12s. 6d. net.

Such books as Mr. Field's safeguard revision on its traditional side; the follies and ignorances of quack revisers have no longer any chance. The last thirty years have perfected liturgical knowledge, and assured the safety of revision. The scheme and meaning of ancient liturgies are now seen to be so wise and big, the scope for development from their principles so infinite, the Christian consensus about them so imposing, the continuity of worship which they mediate so helpful and inspiring, that they must always say the decisive word in any revision. Tradition here proves to be the perfect freedom. Mr. Field deals only with the Eucharistic liturgies. He makes a careful and thorough comparison of the Prayer-Books of 1549 and 1561, both with each other and with Missals Eastern, Gallican, and Roman.

## I.

The Eucharistic Liturgy is of course the most important problem before our revisers, and naturally, therefore, its revision is less forward than that of the daily Offices. We have little patience with those who say that, because the amendment of our dislocated Canon matters so supremely, therefore no revision which omits or defers action there is worth anything at all. Just because it is so important, we must expect to proceed slowly with it. It involves, though not, as some imagine, doctrinal change, at least doctrinal emphasis and doctrinal considerations which are bound to move slowly. Even apart from this, a particular patience is needed where devotional habit is touched at its most intimate and solemn moment. The Convocation compromise has indeed no chance of survival; it merely marks, as it were, a stage in conversation; but the policy of alternative uses is as yet too young to expect immediate agreement upon. But we see meanwhile no objection in reason to proceeding in two stages with revision: first, with that of the daily Offices and occasional rites, and the second with that of the Canon. That would correspond with fact. For with regard to the latter, we are still discussing principles; with regard to the former, we have got as far as the weighing of details. So in this paper we do intend to do no more than sum up the present position over the arrangement of the Canon, but to discuss detailed points of the Revision outside that.

## II.

Is it not time for all sections of the Church of England to recognize that some change in the Canon is inevitable, and that postponement is doing real harm? And, further, that the demand for it is both reasonable and impeccably loyal?

It is due, in the first instance, to the happy vigour of sacramental

life and devotion in our midst. It is due no less to the profound study of liturgical history and form during the last fifty years. Thus, both devotion and scholarship have learned the defects of our present Liturgy—a strong combination. Liturgiology is a fearsome word, and sounds fit for the study alone. As a matter of fact, it has broken out of the study, swept through the sacristy, and is a subject of living interest to considerable numbers of the laity. Rightly so, because it is bound up closely both with public worship and with the private life of prayer, and affects everybody. Now the desire of any loyal, eager Churchman can only be that his Eucharistic Order be beyond reproach, be the best in Christendom. The Prayer-Book cannot pretend to give us that. It can claim, indeed, to be sufficient, but the right pride of loyalty asks for more than that, and will never cease to do so.

As a direct result of its present imperfection, a number of unfortunate and undesirable consequences follow, plain for all to see.

1. The Use of Canterbury, if we may call it so, has ceased to be the model for its daughter churches, the churches in communion with it overseas. The process, indeed, began long ago with the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and has by no means ended with the publication this year of the new South African Office.* Within the Anglican Communion there is a growing variety of use, due, not to racial variety or national need, nor yet to any partisan churchmanship, but simply to the faults of the mother Liturgy. That is not a good ground for difference, and the simplest and most honest way of amending it is to amend the Liturgy, and to do it by resolutely eschewing party considerations, and aiming at the best Order *qua* Order. That is made perfectly possible, even easy, by the fact that any new form will require a long period of experimental use, so that there is no question at all of abolishing the present 1661 Order. But why create for such experimental use an Order based on the rotten principle of party compromise, which pleases nobody, which in itself is not good, and which can only lead to failure and exasperation? Surely such procedure brings but shame upon a great Mother Church.

2. These considerations are reinforced by other facts of the situation. The unsatisfactoriness of the present Canon has led to wide and practical attempts to improve it. Some clergy habitually say the Prayer of Oblation after the Consecration Prayer; a larger number commingle our Canon and the Roman. Be it granted that these are unhealthy symptoms; they are natural, and by no means necessarily disloyal. They constitute rather an in-

* *Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion.* Grocott and Sherry, Church Square, Grahamstown. It is fully reviewed by Dr. Frere in the *Church Quarterly* for July, 1920.

stinctive protest. Centuries ago the Roman Liturgy, coming into direct competition with the Gallican forms, swallowed them up and destroyed them. Now that the Anglican Church has lost its insularity, history is beginning to repeat itself. The English and the Roman liturgies have come into inevitable contact and conflict. It is a silent battle which, now that it is once joined, must be fought to a finish. We have no fear as to the result, for liturgiology has not accredited the Roman Liturgy any more than it has the English. But undoubtedly it is a greater assistance to lively sacramental devotion, and guides it wisely and fully. The way, however, to insure its defeat, if that be wished, is not to curse the clergy and people who privately use it, but so to strengthen our own Order as to fulfil by its means their legitimate desires. It is ridiculous to suppose that the doctrine of the Scottish, the American, the South African Offices cannot be held in the Church of England, or, indeed, that it is not identical with that of the Church of England. Why, then, can it not be expressed in the Church of England Office as it is in those, or as in that of 1549? Until it is, instinct and devotion will continue to supplement and insert, and the Roman elements maintain their occupation.

3. Statesmanship and charity alike add one more argument. Men have grown sick of party bitterness, and crave a new era within the Church of a truly Catholic toleration and love. Now "Evangelicals" are perfectly content with the present Office, and the present Office is in any case guaranteed to them as long as they wish it. Others, who certainly love their communions no less, are not content. Well, content them, and save the whole Church from Bishops to little children from this misease, and the daily difficulties to which it gives rise. Many "Evangelicals" feel already, we believe, that it is no longer reasonable nor right for them to refuse to "Moderates" and to "Catholics" a request which is indisputably loyal and legitimate, is based on sound scholarship, affects their deepest prayer-life, and the granting of which would bring a peace and mutual confidence altogether new. It is a simple remedy; the well-disposed could agree to it in an afternoon.

It would involve, indeed, an alternative Office. But that we shall already possess if the present proposals go through. We fail to see any real difficulty or disadvantage over the existence of two Offices. None exists in Scotland. Englishmen accustomed to innumerable and violent differences in ceremonial use, would find no distraction in a rearrangement of text. For it is important to notice that the changes desired can mostly be accomplished by rearrangement. Over those that cannot—*e.g.*, the provision of an *anamnesis*—there is little controversy; all parties are sufficiently agreed. Now, no Revision which is mainly a rearrangement of what is well known

already can possibly render his Communion Service unfamiliar to the Englishman. What he finds natural in America, he will find easy in his village church. The English use has its own atmosphere, colour, and rhythm, the virtues of which would not be lost, but perfected and established by rearrangement.

If there be any revision of the Canon at all, there *must* be a period when two Offices are in alternate use. The question is, What form shall the new one take? Some suggest the Scottish; but that Liturgy looks better on paper than it runs in practice. Some ask for that of 1549, here and there amended—a far better plan. But we would like to suggest that the easiest plan, and the most helpful to the communion as a whole, would be to adopt for experimental use the latest and best of the living uses within its borders, the South African.

We have gone farther than we intended in the way of positive suggestion. It is enough, perhaps, at present to make it clear that circumstance and fact have made a revision of the Canon inevitable; that it is no longer possible to suspect those who ask for it of disloyalty or any other bad or secret motive; and that it is difficult to bring sound argument against giving satisfaction and peace to all by the simple expedient of an alternative Office, which shall be the best which those who feel most deeply and loyally the unsatisfactoriness of the present one can recommend to us.

## III.

A comparison of the Convocation Revision and Canon Dalton's shows at once how good is the former. It has made no changes which are bold or exciting, and none which are fussy or irritating. It is certainly of wisdom that a first Revision be conservative, and this provides for little more than imperative need. The term "need" covers different types of change: enrichment of matter, improvements of form, increase of variable elements, the easing of rubrical directions, and a slight reduction of archaisms. Canon Dalton goes farther in each of these directions. To secure greater intelligibility, for instance, he gives an English heading to each Psalm, an excellent idea to which everyone will assent; but then he proceeds to retranslate the whole Psalter! That is a mere dream, and not a good one. But other suggestions, more seriously meant, are equally impossible to contemplate. He alters the Lord's Prayer—"*even as*" for "*as it is*" *in heaven*; in the *Te Deum* he writes *Hosts* for *Sabbaoth*, and *Thou didst not scorn the Virgin's Child to be* for *Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb*. We need not multiply instances. Now changes of this sort are not worth while; they merely irritate; they alter splendid and familiar rhythm for an infinitesimal gain.

Altering rhythm has another bad effect, hitherto insufficiently

considered. It puts out of action much of our superb store of Church music. Thus stated, it may seem a small point. But to destroy all our settings of *Te Deum* from Tallis to Stanford resembles for wantonness the smashing of countless stained-glass windows. It is robbing the Church of a peculiar wealth and beauty. The official committees had their experts in rhythm and music, and did not make such mistakes.

Another blemish of Canon Dalton's book is that he often does not indicate where his text differs from that of the Revision. In the first rubric of Morning Prayer, for instance, the Revision, dealing with the omissions in the Office when it is followed by Holy Communion, reads: ". . . The Collect of the day shall be omitted; after the Collect for Grace shall immediately be said. . . ." Canon Dalton's version reads: ". . . the Collect of the Day shall be omitted; and after the Lesser Litany, the Lord's Prayer, the Versicles that follow, and *one Collect, either that for Peace or that for Grace,* have been read, shall immediately be said. . . ." Here he certainly improves on the Revision, but it ought to be indicated that it is his own gloss. This practice, which renders a watchful comparison between the two texts necessary at every point, greatly reduces the value and helpfulness of his edition. The reader has a right to know always and at once what is new Prayer-Book and what is Canon Dalton.

The main changes made by the Revision in Morning Prayer are these: The first rubric excises duplications when the Office is followed by Holy Communion. The second allows the normal replacing of the Exhortation by " Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God." A shorter alternative form of General Confession and Absolution is provided. Antiphons appropriate to the seasons are given to the *Venite*—the most imaginative reform in the book. The *Te Deum* is printed in its three paragraphs. The Athanasian Creed may be optionally recited on Trinity Sunday.

But Canon Dalton is bolder. He supplies twelve Old Testament canticles—for each week-day two alternatives for use at will instead of *Te Deum*—and a new set of versicles and responses for variety's sake, the old set being retained for Evensong. In principle, both these suggestions are valuable, though we do not care for the versicles proposed.

Now the case for a new alternative to the *Te Deum* is very strong. The *Benedicite* grows less and less popular, and its joyousness is inappropriate at all times when it is habitually sung, except on Septuagesima Sunday. Here is a crying need to which the Revision has not responded. As Canon Dalton says:

> From the sixth to the sixteenth century the *Te Deum,* " the most triumphant of all Christian songs of thanksgiving " was reserved exclusively for use on Sundays and certain festivals. The monotonous recitation

of this sublime and " matchless hymn of praise " daily throughout the year tends to obscure its triumphant character and meaning. . . . If our cathedral and collegiate choirs (and such clergy as so desire in their daily recitation of the Church Office) are allowed to revert to the dominical and festal use, its full force and beauty will be far better appreciated by them. . . . The desirability (of substituting an optional use of Old Testament canticles) would appear to have been almost unanimously affirmed by the Lower House of Convocation, July 6, 1909. . . . Here, as elsewhere, the difference between those who really use the daily Office and those who only use the Sunday service, and say they feel no want of anything beyond the *Te Deum*, should be borne in mind. The extraordinary thing is that the Scripture-loving Church of England should be the only branch of the Catholic Church, Eastern or Western, which does not use the Old Testament canticles in public worship.

We would go further, and beg that even if so liberal a provision be at present out of the question, special provision for Lent be at once given us. The need is crying, and here affects the Sunday service as well. Still more urgent is the need of special provision for Holy Week. Great numbers of people attend the morning Office daily through that week, and the Prayer-Book feeds them with fare not only rigid and meagre, but in this respect quite inappropriate. Is it really impossible to use as morning canticles during Holy Week those sections of Lamentations employed as lections (yet usually *sung*) in the old Nocturnes of that season? Not only do these poignant dirges possess all the atmosphere and associations of the week, but we would thus recover for the Church the use of much magnificent old English Church music. To win back " the majestic architectural splendour of works like these,"* " works which without extravagance and without disadvantage we can place beside similar compositions by Palestrina and Vittoria,"† together with the strange pathos which always attaches to this ancient elegy, is well worth their transference from the Lectionary of Holy Monday to the place of greater emphasis which their daily use as canticles would given them. While Holy Week is a tide wherein many non-liturgical devotions are rightly given free play, anything which can strengthen affection for the Divine Office and enrich its sympathy would be welcomed without controversy or dispute. We would urge this most eagerly upon the revisers.

## IV.

The Convocation Revision is weakest in execution when adding occasional prayers for use at discretion after Evensong, or at other times. These include intercessions for the King's Dominions, the unity of Christendom, foreign missions, the sick, the faithful departed, the increase of the ministry, Convocation, Confirmation

* E. Walker, *History of Music in England*, on "The Lamentations " of Tallis.

† H. B. Collins, paper on "Latin Church Music by Early English Composers," Musical Association, February 18, 1913.

candidates, Sunday observance, Navy and Army, elections, husbandry, fishermen, industries, industrial peace, Universities and schools, hospitals, the absent, travellers; in the times of famine, of pestilence, and during the vacancy of a see or parochial cure. A fine list! And the form in which they are set out, each prayer prefaced by bidding, versicle, and response, is excellent. But it has apparently been impossible to find or to make prayers which reach the standard of merit, beauty, and dignity set by the rest of the Prayer-Book. Some of the clergy, including ourselves, are using them regularly, and discovering their deficiencies. It is pardonable, therefore, to deal with the subject at some length.

Now there are two principles which can act as guide for the insertion of additional prayers. The first is to make a list of subjects for which it is helpful or necessary to provide prayers. This has evidently been the principle of the revisers. The second is to begin by finding prayers which match the standard set by those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which have proved their usefulness by use both wide and constant, and to include them whether or no they could be fitted into an ideally complete list of subjects. Both principles meet in the Revision on a large scale, by the inclusion of Compline: a glorious gain to the Prayer-Book from every point of view. This plan has the advantage of maintaining the splendour of our Prayer-Book, and of meeting such real need as is betokened by the actual wide use of such prayers.

The beauty of a prayer is a thing of great account. For the Prayer-Book, now more than ever, moulds, directs, sets the standard to the public devotion of all English-speaking Christianity. A poor or a dull prayer fails to grip the attention or the heart of a congregation, even though it says what the congregation wish to pray. Also, swiftly and decisively, it lowers the dignity of the congregational act before God.

Again, two kinds of beauty must meet in a good public prayer—that of expression and that of rhythm. About the former we need say little; the latter, less obvious, is not less essential. It is the large church which tests a prayer. There faults of rhythm become at once noticeable and painful. No prayer wanting in rhythmical balance can be happily intoned. No prayer can *last* if its rhythm is bad; it may be heard once or twice with pleasure and devotion, but then it becomes tedious and almost nauseating. We said above that the revising Committees contained experts in music and literary rhythm, but in the latter respect they certainly failed in many of the new occasional prayers.

One further distinction must be borne in mind ere the new prayers can be discussed. Prayer can follow two main forms—the collect form, or what we must call simply the "prayer form." The collect form in all its richness, terseness, and suppleness is brilliantly

described in an appendix to Dr. Dearmer's *Art of Public Worship*. Fortunately, this generation expresses itself best in Collect form; and, contrary to received opinion, the Church can boast of some noble modern collects, and of a few gifted collect composers. The reverse is the case with the prayer. The seventeenth century could achieve it now and then (not always—witness the Thanksgiving for Victory at the end of Prayers for Use at Sea). But in a modern prayer a full stop seems to be fatal. We cannot manage a chain of sentences in petition. Where the revisers have not kept to the collect form, their work is almost invariably poor.

These points give us real criteria by which to criticize the prayers proposed in the Revision, and to suggest other claimants. Let us at once take an example of the latter for illustration. The Laudian prayer for the Church* deserves inclusion, even though its subject-matter is covered by existing prayers. It is already used everywhere. It says much with singular directness and brilliance of diction. It has a unique power of hammering into listening hearts and minds its meaning: a power not only of waking attention, but also of arousing affection for itself as a prayer. It would add its measure of glory even to the Prayer-Book. It carries its own atmosphere—both Catholic and English, as should be—and is the more valuable because it is a prayer and not a collect. Canon Dalton's edition includes it, but ruins it by substituting a conventional ending for the pregnant and beautiful " O Thou Holy One of Israel."

The Gelasian Collect for the Church, *O God of unchangeable power and eternal light . . .* is scarcely less widely used. Therefore it ought to be made available, universally and conveniently, in the Prayer-Book.† Among collects of the same indisputable claim, that for unity from the Roman Missal, and Bishop Cotton's for the spread of the Kingdom, have been most happily included by the revisers. But the principle should surely be extended. Two collects popularized in the days of war ought not to be dropped. The first, Bishop Paget's Collect for the Peace of the Nations, *Almighty God, from Whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed,* is badly needed now, and will always be needed, far more than the proposed prayer in time of war; the second, *Remember, Lord, what Thou hast wrought in us, and not what we deserve,* is too good for all times to be forgotten.

* Most gracious Father, we humbly beseech Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church. Fill it with all truth; in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purge it; where it is in error, direct it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where anything is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is in want, furnish it; where it is divided and rent asunder, make up the breaches of it, O Thou Holy One of Israel. Amen.

† It is included in the Scottish Prayer-Book.

Let us repeat, the value of proceeding by this principle is that it guarantees the standard and the glory of the Prayer-Book. Of course, it must not be carried too far. But the method of the revisers, to supply prayers for a schedule of subjects, has not proved happy in result. A few are good—that for the King's dominions, those for the departed, besides those mentioned above—a few perhaps adequate, some are dull, and some bad. It is difficult to specify in detail, for one clause, or even one word (*e.g.*, " therein " in the third Rogation Day intercession mars a prayer with some good points), often ruins the whole. None are so irretrievably bad as some drawn by Canon Dalton from the American Prayer-Book, notably those for children and for social service. But of most we shall soon get very tired. That for the sick and suffering is unusable. It certainly will not intone ! However good its source, its phrases call up a past fashion of piety in which it is no longer real to express ourselves. It is odd that good prayers for the suffering are so hard to come by, and how seldom they introduce the comfort of Christ's own sufferings. This, the composition of a Cambridgeshire vicar, which we heard by chance in his village church, comes nearer to the tenderness and hope of our Faith, and covers many sorrows:

O Lord God, our heavenly Father, regard, we beseech Thee, with Thy Divine pity the pains of all Thy children, and grant that the Passion of our Lord and His infinite merits may make fruitful for good the miseries of the innocent, the sufferings of the sick, and the sorrows of the bereaved; through Him who suffered in our flesh and died for our sake, Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

But there are serious gaps in the very schedule of subjects for which the revisers have appointed prayers. Actual attempt to use the second part of the prayers at Evensong flexibly and intelligently throughout the year has disclosed such primary needs as the following:

A prayer for sinners and the indifferent, for which we would suggest the collect which usually ends the Office of Sext.

A prayer for Church-workers (the faithful working laity are sadly neglected), for which Dr. Bright's fine collect, everywhere in use, *O Lord, without whom our labour is but lost, and with whom Thy little ones go forth as the mighty,* serves perfectly.

The second prayer in commemoration of the faithful departed in the Scottish Book is a helpful alternative or supplement to those proposed.

The thanksgiving for saints, *Almighty and everlasting God, we yield unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy saints,* in the flawless form standing in the American Prayer-Book, is a happy and most valuable variant to the General Thanksgiving on Saints' Days.

The Collect in the Irish Prayer-Book " to be used in schools and

colleges" is fine, both in form and content. A search through the particular prayers of our public schools and University colleges would discover collects for educational purposes, we are sure, nobler than that provided in the Revision.

Less urgent, but scarcely less useful, is such a provision of additional collects for the Church year as are placed in the Scottish Book with the Post-Communion prayers. These can be easily drawn from the vast stores in ancient liturgies. Among them should certainly stand, *O Lord, who under a wonderful sacrament*, in universal use; and that masterpiece of Dr. Bright:

> O God, who hast brought us near to an innumerable company of angels, and to the spirits of just men made perfect; grant us during our earthly pilgrimage to abide in their fellowship, and in our heavenly country to become partakers of their joy; through, etc.

This brings us to the consideration of the new collects proposed for various saints' days and festivals. Everybody must be most grateful that the Revision gives us here sensible relief in its provision for black-letter days. It is astounding, however, that it does not include Bishop Wordsworth's superb and imperishable Collect for St. George's Day, which the Church in England cannot and will not do without. Canon Dalton supplies a separate collect (and often an Epistle and Gospel) for every black-letter day. Most of them are derived from *The Book of Occasional Offices for Use in the Diocese of Salisbury*, where Bishop John Wordsworth's hand is evident, and from the Rev. A. Campbell Fraser's *Collects for Each of the Black-Letter Days*, and on the whole attain a high standard. Always they bring out the message or meaning of the saint in Christian history, but the latter would generally gain by abbreviation and readjustment of their clauses; their expression, if bold, is often faulty, and their rhythm poor.

We have said enough, perhaps, on the subject of the prayers. The Revision has done much for the Prayer-Book, but it might in this respect have done more, and done it better. Such suggestions as have been made have been already proved by the experience of constant use, and their standard of excellence is plain for all to see and judge. The Prayer-Book, we feel, would have been enriched both for use and in beauty by their insertion. But it must be admitted that prayers dealing adequately with many needs, especially our greater social and international difficulties, are still to find. And so we venture a suggestion to the editor of THEOLOGY. Let him encourage the composition of prayers and collects by giving half a page monthly for the printing of the best that may be sent to him. By this means good prayers will not be modestly hidden in our village churches, but be made available for wider use on their merits, and constitute, it may be, a valuable corpus for future revisers to con-

sider. The devotional ardour and literary ability of the Church is at least as high as at any previous moment of its history. Whether through free retranslations of ancient collects or by original compositions, here would be opportunity for gifts of permanent value both to the Prayer-Book, to our public worship of God, and to the desire of all Christian hearts.

E. Milner-White.

## AN ANCIENT EGYPTIAN FORETASTE OF THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION

It has long been a much debated question among students of religion as to where and when the idea arose that men could be reborn through ceremonial washing, an idea that is so striking a feature of Catholic teaching about the significance of Baptism. That Christian Baptism is derived from the "mysteries" of the pagan Greeks has been for some time past a favourite view of the Modernists; but, as Mr. W. Scott has recently pointed out,* there is nothing to show that the participators in these mysteries, either at their initiation or on any subsequent occasion, underwent a lustration as a result of which they were thought to be reborn. Mr. Scott therefore suggests† that the later Jews took over Baptism, together with the belief in its regenerative effect, from the Syrians and Phœnicians, among whom existed the practice of bathing in sacred pools. Among other instances he cites the sacred pool at Bambyce, in which, according to Lucian, *Dea Syria*, men swam, and in which the image of the goddess and other "holy things" were dipped at stated times. Mr. Scott infers from Lucian's description of this ritual "that it was thought that the water was thereby 'impregnated with the vital energy of the deity,' and that this vital energy acted on the fishes of the pool (and doubtless also on the men who swam in it), and put divine life into them." This and a few similar practices are the nearest approaches to Catholic Baptism that can be said with any certainty to have existed among the Syrian and Phœnician neighbours of the Jews. It must be confessed that the resemblances are not very striking.

Hitherto no one has realized the fact that Baptism occupied a by no means unimportant place among the religious practices of Ancient Egypt. A well-known scene, that occurs in almost every Egyptian temple, not only shows that the Egyptians practised

* Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, abstract of proceedings for the year 1917-18, pp. 54 foll.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

Baptism, but the explanatory legends accompanying the scene, as well as numbers of passages in the religious texts of all periods,* also suggest that the ideas of the Egyptian priests about the rite may have some bearing upon the Baptismal doctrine of the Historic Christian Church.

By the end of the fifth millennium B.C., some 800 years before the reign of Menes, Heliopolis had apparently become the capital of a united Egypt. Here, so many authorities hold, were developed what we are wont to consider the characteristically Egyptian ideas of the kingship, the canons of Egyptian art, and the ritual, organization, and theory of what appears later as the official religion.

The chief divinity worshipped at Heliopolis was the sun-god Rē'-Atum, who appears in historic times as the state-god of Egypt. A striking feature of Egyptian religious texts of all periods is the way in which they associate cleanliness and purity with this god. Everything connected with him was pure, even, so we are told, the very lotus flower that he held to his nose in order to inhale its fragrance. All persons and offerings that entered his temple had to be pure—both the clergy and lay-folk before entering underwent purification—and the ordinary word for a priest of the sun-temple was *wē'eb—i.e.*, "pure one."

The god himself is constantly spoken of as undergoing purification daily at dawn before he appeared above the horizon, either in some mythological pool, or in a sacred pool connected with his cult at Heliopolis. The two gods, Horus and Thōth, were regarded as the bath-attendants of Rē'-Atum, pouring water over him, and then, at the conclusion of his ablutions, rubbing his back and feet. According to another account it was the goddess Ḳebḥōwet, the daughter of Anubis, who bathed him, emptying over him four pitchers of water.

The king of Heliopolis was the high-priest of the sun-god. He was also considered to be the earthly embodiment of the god, who was himself regarded as the prototype of all Heliopolitan kings. At the same time the king was held to be the god's son. As high-priest the king entered the sun-temple daily at dawn in order to minister to the god. But since no one, as we have seen, could enter the sun-god's presence unless he were pure, the king, before officiating in the temple, had to undergo lustration. The lustration took place in an annexe of the temple, called the House of the Morning, so

* For a detailed discussion of Egyptian ideas about lustration, and for full particulars as to the sources from which the information thereon given in this article is derived, see the writer's articles, "Lustrations and the Heliopolitan Sun-God" in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, vol. xl., pp. 57-66, 85-91; "Some Notes on the Ancient Egyptian Practice of Washing the Dead" in *Journal of Egyptian Archæology*, vol. v., pp. 117-124; "The House of the Morning" in *op. cit.*, vol. v., pp. 148-165; and "Sacramental Ideas and Usages in Ancient Egypt" in *Recueil de Travaux*, vol. xxxix., pp. 44-78.

named on account of the early hour at which the rite was performed. As we shall shortly see, the lustrators were priests impersonating divinities. When the king died he was supposed to ascend to heaven, which, being the abode of the sun-god, he could not enter unless he were pure. Therefore, before his ascent could take place he had to undergo a similar purification to that undergone by him in the House of the Morning before entering the Heliopolitan sun-temple. The religious texts speak of the king as undergoing this purification in pools connected with the Heliopolitan sun-cult or in mythological pools and water-holes, and represent him as washing himself or as being washed by divinities.

The sun-god was characterized not only by his purity (and by purity is meant freedom from physical rather than from moral defilement), but also by his righteousness. He was said to be "he who created righteousness." The sun-god, however, not only created righteousness, but he is actually stated to "live" (*i.e.*, feed) on it, just as the Nile-god Ḥāpi is said to live on fish. He also, we are told, loves righteousness, and what he abominates is wickedness. All, therefore, who would approach him either in this world or after death must not only be physically pure, but must be righteous also. Thus a passage from a hymn to the sun-god in the *Book of the Dead* runs as follows: "I [the speaker is the deceased person, in the first instance the king] have come unto thee, lord of gods, Atum-Rē'-Harakhti, that I may present unto thee righteousness, for I know that thou livest thereon."* Accordingly we find that lustrations possessed an ethical significance. Chapter XVII. of the *Book of the Dead* makes the deceased (originally the dead king†) say that the unrighteousness appertaining to him has been removed by washing in the two solar pools attached to the temple at Heracleopolis Magna. Two passages in the *Pyramid Texts* represent the gods who washed the king before his ascent to heaven as reciting, while they poured water over him, a spell asserting his righteousness. According to the bilingual *Rhind Papyrus*, the washing of the deceased by Horus and Thōth was a moral as well as a physical cleansing. "Horus purifies thee on thine entry into the necropolis to see the great god in the necropolis; there is no manner of fault in thee. Thōth cleanses thee. Thou art clothed in thy bandages; all thy limbs are furnished with unguent; there is no offence against the god in thee; there is no decay in thy body. We purify thee with water that has come from Elephantine, with natron that has come from El-Kab, with milk from Athribis." Lastly, according to the

* See the writer's article "Righteousness" (Egyptian) in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x., p. 796.

† On the democratization of the funerary beliefs and practices, see Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, p. 256; N. de G. Davies and A. H. Gardiner, *The Tomb of Amenemhēt*, p. 55, with footnote.

*Book of Breathings*, the deceased (again, of course, the king in the first instance), before he enters the Hall of the Two Rights, is washed by the goddesses Uto and Nekhbet, and, being thereby cleansed from all evil, every abomination, receives the name "Stone of Righteousness."

Influenced doubtless by the yearly phenomenon of the inundation, the Egyptian priests maintained that in the beginning there was nothing but a waste of waters, which they personified as a god, Nun. Out of these waters was born the sun-god.* According to another theory of the priests that finds constant expression in the religious literature, the sun-god was reborn every morning. He is spoken of as issuing from the womb of his mother, the sky-goddess, as an infant in human form, or as a calf; for this goddess had, according to one conception, the form of a woman, and, according to another, that of a cow. We have pointed out above that the sun-god was supposed to undergo lustration every morning before he ascended into heaven. Thus, in the person of this god, birth, water, and ablutions were brought into close association.

There are several instances of the daily rebirth of the sun-god being connected with water or with his matutinal ablutions. The theories of his daily rebirth and of his being born in the first instance out of the primeval ocean were combined, and so the water of Nun is said to give birth to him every day. The name assigned to the celestial cow-goddess, the mother of the sun-god, is Mēḥet-wēret, which means "Great Flood." Again we read in the *Pyramid Texts* of the sun-god crossing over the flooded Field of Earu to the place where the gods are born, that he may be born there with them. Yet again the sacred pool at Khereḥa, near Heliopolis, was called the water of Nun, and in it the sun-god was supposed to wash his face—doubtless daily at dawn, and, judging from the name, in order that he might be reborn. Finally the Field of Life, where, according to one account, the sun-god was washed by the goddess Ḳebḥōwet, bore the additional name of Birth-Place of Rē'.

The king, as we have seen, entered the Heliopolitan sun-temple daily at dawn in the capacity of high-priest. He began the long series of toilet episodes which formed the greater part of the temple liturgy by sprinkling the cultus-image of the sun-god with water, thereby simulating the regenerative lustration which the sun-god himself was supposed to undergo at that very time. But before he could officiate, the king had also to undergo lustration. The water used for this purpose was brought from the sacred pool attached to the temple, the very pool in which, according to some accounts, the sun-god himself was supposed to bathe. Now, as

* Erman, *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, pp. 25 foll.

has been stated above, the king was regarded as the embodiment of the sun-god. Naturally, therefore, the lustration was supposed to have the same regenerative effect on the king as on the god. One of the formulæ pronounced by the lustrators, as they washed or sprinkled the king, identifies the water with that of the primeval ocean Nun, and asserts that it gives birth to him every day. According to another such formula, the king was "rejuvenated" by the water. The washing or sprinkling of the king was performed by two officiants, who impersonated either Horus and Thōth, the bath-attendants of the sun-god, or Horus and Sēth, the tutelary gods of Lower and Upper Egypt respectively. To render the impersonation more realistic, and therefore more effective, the lustrators appear to have worn masks.

Viewed as the earthly embodiment or as the son of the sun-god, the king at death was assimilated to the god or retained his position of son. In either of these capacities he was thought to be reborn every day and then ascend into heaven. Before his ascent he had to undergo lustration, with which, as in the case of his divine prototype, his rebirth is closely associated. In order to insure the dead king's daily rebirth his corpse was washed before burial, and when it lay inaccessible in the grave, this lustration was simulated by the daily pouring out of a libation of water in the cultus-chamber of the tomb-chapel. Both the lustrators and libationers impersonated the gods who were supposed to assist at the ablutions of the solarized dead king. Both in lustration- and libation-formulæ and in other funerary texts there are many passages which describe the daily matutinal ablutions of the dead king, either in his rôle of actual sun-god, or in that of the god's son and intimate companion. These passages closely connect his washing with rebirth—in fact, give us plainly to understand that it was as a result of the washing that the rebirth took place. The dead king, like the sun-god, is said to cross over the flooded Field of Earu to the horizon, the place where the gods are born, that he may be born there with them. The formula pronounced during the libation at the third hour of the night at the annual re-enactment of the embalmment of Osiris represents that god* as reborn. "O, Osiris, take to thee this thy cool water which thou didst make for thyself at one time with the gods. It came to pass that the god went to his land, to the primeval place wherein he was born, where he came into being as Rē'. Now as for every god when his old age cometh . . ., they go to the land wherein they were born, the primeval land wherein they came into being as

* Osiris was the dead king *par excellence*, if not, as Dr. A. H. Gardiner maintains, the personification of dead kingship. In this formula Osiris is represented not only as reborn, but fills the rôle of Atum as the creator of water and the gods; for Atum by one act created water and begat Shu and Tefēnet (see Blackman, *Recueil de Travaux*, vol. xxxix., p. 67).

Rē', that they may live, be little, become youths. Thou art caused to come into being, thou livest, thou becomest old, yet thou remainest sound. Take to thee this thy cool water which is in this land." The dead king is said to be washed by Ḳebḥōwet in the Field of Life, the birth-place of the sun-god. After being washed at dawn in the water of a pool in another mythological locality, he was suckled, so we are told, by the goddesses Isis and Nephthys as though he were a babe. The assertion that the womb of the sky-goddess is impregnated with a god's seed, which is straightway identified with the dead king, immediately follows a description of his lustration. In another passage he is said to be washed, and then take to himself his copper bones and stretch out his indestructible limbs which are in the womb of the sky-goddess—*i.e.*, as a result of the lustration he was reborn with an unearthly and indestructible body. In an inscription in the temple of Sethos I. at Abydos, Horus (one of the sun-god's bath-attendants) is said to act as the protector of Osiris, to wash away his defilements of yesterday, and to make him come into being in the early morning as Rē'.

It has already been pointed out that the king in one aspect was regarded as the son of the sun-god. This has a very important bearing upon the ideas associated with the washing of the living and dead king in the water of solar pools.

The sun-god, we are told in a book of magic, when he came into being out of the primeval ocean, found himself alone. He thereupon begat of himself and spat out the god Shu and the goddess Tefēnet.* Accordingly the water used for the ceremonial washing of the living and dead king, or for pouring out as a libation in his tomb-chapel, was identified with the efflux of the sun-god, and by means of it the king was thought to be rebegotten as well as reborn. The water with which the king was sprinkled in the temple House of the Morning can be designated "that which was in the fist of Atum (the sun-god)." Similarly the water which a deceased person (originally the deceased king) desired to be used for his posthumous lustration is "that which has issued as the spittle of Rē." Again, in another funerary lustration formula the water is said to be "that which first issued from Atum." Yet again, when the priest poured out a libation at the third hour of the night, at the ceremony of the re-enactment of the embalmment of Osiris, he addressed the god thus: "Take to thee this thy cool water which is in this land, which begets all living things, all things which this land gives. It is the begetter of all living things; yea, all things issue from it. Thou partakest thereof, thou livest thereon, thou art healthy thereby, thou breathest the air that is in it. It hath begotten thee,

* For particulars see *Recueil de Travaux*, vol. xxxix., p. 71, with note 4; and Budge, *Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, p. 15.

and thou comest forth living on all things thou desirest." Through the water, regarded as the generative efflux of the sun-god, the living and dead king was not, it would seem, thought to be just rebegotten and reborn, but to be rebegotten and reborn as the god's own son. Thus, the washing of the king was not only regenerative in its effect, but also affiliative. According to the latter part of Utterance 222 of the *Pyramid Texts* the dead king, through being washed in a sacred pool in the Heliopolitan nome by Horus and Sēth, is said to be born for the former and conceived for the latter god, and is also said to have come into being and to have grown tall. The Utterance closes with the words: "O, Atum, . . . enfold him in thy embrace; he is thy son of thy body for ever"—that is to say, that when the king came forth rebegotten and reborn out of the sacred water, the sun-god was called upon to recognize him as his son. A passage in Chapter XVII. of the *Book of the Dead* makes the deceased (originally the dead king) assert that he was washed on the day he was born in one of the two solar pools attached to the temple at Heracleopolis Magna. Now the name of this pool was "Seed (var. 'Begetter') of Millions." This suggests that it was the custom in predynastic Heliopolis to wash a baby prince in the water of a solar pool, by which act, the water being identified with the generative efflux of the sun-god, the child was thought to be rebegotten and reborn as the god's son. It should be noted that another name for this pool is "Mother of Millions." The water could thus be regarded both as the womb out of which the person washed issued reborn, and, at the same time, the seed which impregnated the womb. This double aspect of the lustral water seems also to find expression in Utterance 563 of the *Pyramid Texts*, where, after a description of the dead king's ablutions in the Field of Earu, it is said that the womb of the sky-goddess teems with the seed of the god which is in her, and which is identified with the dead king. As the priest who impersonated Horus poured holy water over the king at his matutinal lustration in the House of the Morning, he might repeat a formula in which occur the words "Thou art rejuvenated like thy father Atum." This expression, combined with the fact that another formula used at the same performance represents the water as the generative efflux of Atum, points to a rebirth in the capacity of son rather than in that of embodiment of the god. It has been proposed above that the passage in Chapter XVII. of the *Book of the Dead* suggests that the custom existed, anyhow in very early times, of washing a young prince in the water of a solar pool in order that he might be rebegotten and reborn as the sun-god's child. Two temple reliefs seem to support this proposition. Both depict the king in his infancy standing between two divinities (or rather, of course, priests impersonating

them), who pour water over him. The divinities are in the one case the sun-god and the Theban Amūn, and in the other the sun-god and Mont. Both Amūn and Mont, however, by the time these reliefs were carved, had long been identified with the sun-god. The fact that the two lustrators are supposed to be the sun-god and another solarized divinity evidently implies that here also the royal child, as a result of the regenerative washing, was regarded as reborn, not in the capacity of the sun-god himself, but in that of his son. In this connection, be it remembered, the Ethiopian king Pionkhi, when on the way to Heliopolis, where he was to be recognized by the sun-god as his son, washed his face in the sacred pool at Khereḥa in which the god himself was wont to wash his face.

It is hardly necessary to point out the parallels with the Catholic teaching about Baptism that—the grosser elements removed—are to be found in these conceptions of the ancient thinkers of Heliopolis. The putting away of sins, rebirth, and the becoming a child of God, through washing in sacred water—the Heliopolitan priests had thought all that out by, quite possibly, the end of the fifth millennium B.C. So through the "beastly devices of the heathen" was the way prepared for the acceptance and for the stating of the verities of the Catholic Faith.

In the latter part of Utterance 222 of the *Pyramid Texts*, already quoted above, we have a particularly striking parallel with the account of Our Lord's Baptism as given in the first three Gospels. The deceased Egyptian king is spoken of as conceived and born through being washed in a solar pool. On his issuing from the water, the sun-god is bidden to recognize him as his son: "Atum, . . . enfold him in thy embrace. He is thy son of thy body for ever." Our Lord, when He came out of the water, after being baptized by St. John, was recognized by the Divine Father as the Divine Son with the voice from Heaven, "Thou art My beloved Son." "Harnack (*Sayings of Jesus*, Eng. trans., p. 211) gives reasons," says Mr. Scott, "for thinking that in the earliest written record this utterance was given in the form: 'Thou art My Son; *this day have I begotten Thee*'—*i.e.*, in the words of Psalm ii."* But setting aside Harnack's emendation, the account, as it now stands, seems to imply that Our Lord's Baptism was something more than a manifestation to the world of His Sonship—rather that it was a renewal of His begetting by the Father. The writer of this article does not hesitate to affirm that the basis for the Catholic doctrine of Baptism is the well-known passage in the third chapter of St. John's Gospel: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." An attempt thus to connect up pagan and Christian dogma is perfectly compatible with

* Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

orthodoxy. One may express one's standpoint in the words of St. Paul and St. Barnabas, "He [God] left not Himself without witness," and may recognize the working of the Holy Spirit in the conceptions of the ancient pagan theologians, through whom the world was being prepared for "greater things than these." We might even regard these conceptions as almost an essential part of man's psychological "make-up," and hold that in its sacramental aspects Catholicism existed before the Catholic Church, the function of the Church being, "when the fulness of time was come," to set forth in its perfection truth that hitherto had been but dimly envisaged. In the case of many of the conceptions of the ancient pagan religious teachers, no less than in the case of the law and prophets of the Hebrews, we might maintain that Our Lord came not to destroy, but to fulfil—came to give them a new and higher significance.

I do not wish to appear to be laying it down as an established fact that the later Jews borrowed the rite of Baptism direct from Egypt, though it should be remembered that Judea for a time formed part of the dominions of the Ptolemies. It is possible that the idea of rebirth through Baptism was common both to Syria and Egypt; for archæologists are now inclining to the view that we must look to Northern Syria as the centre of a great culture that spread northward to Caucasia and South Russia, and southward to Mesopotamia and Egypt.* However, so far as existing records are concerned, the closest parallels to the Catholic doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration are, as we have seen, to be found in Ancient Egyptian religious texts and representations.

But, as the Editor of THEOLOGY, while discussing the subject of this article with the writer, has suggested, we are perhaps on safer ground in claiming syncretism with, rather than derivation from, Egyptian rites. Christianity seems to have spread very rapidly in Egypt at a comparatively early date, and by the end of the second century there had grown up at Alexandria a great Christian theological school, which took the place, so to speak, of the old pagan theological school at Heliopolis, where Plato is said to have studied. Egyptian teaching about rebirth through washing must have been known not only to the Alexandrine Fathers, but to their instructors before them, and they may well have made use of it in their formulation of the Christian doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

AYLWARD M. BLACKMAN.

* *E.g.*, see *Journal of Egyptian Archæology*, vol. vi., pp. 4 foll.

# ADVERSARIA EXEGETICA

## THE OLD AND THE NEW WORSHIP OF GOD.

### John ii. 13-22.

13. And the Passover of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

14. And He found in the Temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting;

15. And He made a scourge of twisted rush, and cast all out of the Temple, both the sheep and the oxen; and He poured out the small change of the money-changers, and overthrew their tables;

16. And to them that sold doves He said, Take these things hence; make not My Father's house a house of merchandise.

17. His disciples remembered that it had been written, The zeal of Thine house $\frac{\text{shall devour me.}}{\text{consumed me.}}$

18. The Jews then answered and said unto Him, What sign showest Thou unto us, seeing that Thou doest these things?

19. Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this $\frac{\text{Temple,}}{\text{Body,}}$ and within three days I will raise it up.

20. The Jews therefore said, Forty and six years was this $\frac{\text{Temple}}{\text{Body}}$ in building, and wilt Thou raise it up within three days?

21. But He spake of the Temple of His Body.

22. When therefore He was raised from the dead, His disciples remembered that He spake thus; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.

### John ii. 13-22.

13 Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα
ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 14 καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα
καὶ περιστεράς, καὶ τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους· 15 καὶ ποιήσας
φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τά τε πρόβατα
καὶ τοὺς βόας· καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεε τὰ κέρματα καὶ τὰς
τραπέζας ἀνέστρεψε· 16 καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστερὰς πωλοῦσιν εἶπεν,
Ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον
ἐμπορίου. 17 ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν,
Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεταί με. ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ
Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, 18 Τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα
ποιεῖς; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 19 Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν
τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. 20 εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι,
Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν

*τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν ; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγε περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.* [21] *ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγε,* [22] *καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.*

v. 17. *καταφάγεται*, 0162 ℵ A B L ω Sah. Orig. Cyr. *κατέφαγεν*, (13) Latin versions, Syr. Sin. Eus. Epiph.

13. The presence of Jesus at the great Jewish festivals in Jerusalem, and especially at the Passover, is described with great emphasis by St. John (ii. 23, vi. 4, vii. 2 *ff.*, xi. 55, xii. 1, xiii. 1). The fact that the Crucifixion took place during the Passover, at the moment when the Jews were killing the Passover lambs, is fundamental to St. John's interpretation of the death of Jesus. *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* because the author and his readers were conscious of their complete separation from the Jews. St. John's use of the phrase *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* makes it clear that the separation has hardened into open hostility. 14. Preparations are being made for the festival in the Temple. *βόες . . . πρόβατα . . . περιστεράι* the various kinds of animals necessary for the Temple sacrifices. *κερματισταί* for giving change in Jewish money to those who wished to make an offering. The account presumes a large number of pilgrims. 15. *φραγέλλιον* (Latin *flagellum*) *ἐκ σχοινίων* "a scourge of twisted rush," as Westcott says, a "symbol of authority, not a weapon of offence." *κολλυβιστῶν* for *κερματιστῶν* for euphony, avoids *κερματιστῶν κέρματα*. 16. Quotation from Isa. lvi. 7, "Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people," and from Jer. vii. 11, "Is this house which is called by My name become a den of robbers in your eyes?" The more important prophetic background for the episode is, however, Mal. iii. 1 *ff.*, where is described the preparatory coming of the messenger, the coming of the Lord to His Temple, the terror of the people, and the reform of the Temple worship (*cf.* Zech. xi. 4, 7, 11, xiv. 21). 17. Quotation from Ps. lxix. 10, which seems to have been in common Christian use as Messianic and referring to Jesus (xv. 25, xix. 28, Rom. xi. 9, xv. 3, Acts i. 20). The reading *κατέφαγεν* emphasizes the consuming zeal of Jesus, *καταφάγεται*, future, the zeal which leads to His death. 18. *οὖν*, as commonly in St. John, a connecting narrative particle: here it connects v. 18 with v. 16. *ὅτι* referential, in that you do this we ask what sign you show us (Matt. xii. 39, 40). The Jews require a sign which will prove His authority thus to act in the Temple as the Messiah, for the Messiah alone would have the right to act as He had done. 19. The answer implies (*a*) the destruction of the Temple and its miraculous rebuilding; (*b*) the death of Jesus and His resurrection. It is a play on the secondary use of *νάος* for *σῶμα* (1 Cor. vi. 19, 2 Cor. v. 1, vi. 16). The references in the Pauline Epistles show that in Christian language not only the body of the individual Christian was thought of as a temple or tabernacle, but the whole Christian community was the Temple of God, and the Body of Christ (Eph. v. 30, Col. i. 18). *ἐγείρειν* is used with a double meaning, of the building of a house (Deut. xvi. 22) and of the raising of the dead. The Jews deny the possibility of a miraculous rebuilding of the Temple, and fail either to see or understand the real meaning of the answer. *ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις* can only mean "within three days," not "on the third day." The comparison between the Resurrection and the building of the Temple demands a period, not a single moment. Jesus here raises Himself, because He is the Life (x. 17, 18). For the Resurrection as the true sign *cf.* Matt. xii. 40. 20. The Temple which was begun in 20 B.C. was as a matter of fact not finished

till A.D. 63. The passage is, however, complicated by the fact that the meaning of the word Temple is really the Body of Jesus, and it is probable that St. John means his readers to understand that while the Jews are apparently referring to the Temple they are as a matter of fact stating a truth about Jesus. St. John records a passage in which the Jews said that Jesus was not yet fifty years old (viii. 57). 22. The experience of the Christians was that words of Jesus and passages from the Old Testament received their true interpretation after the Resurrection. During the ministry of Jesus the disciples received a teaching which they only understood after the Resurrection. πιστεύειν means here, as almost always in St. John, to gain insight into the real meaning of something, and is closely related to γιγνώσκειν—ὁρᾶν. St. Luke carefully notes this post-Resurrection experience (Luke xxiv. 27, 32, 45). The synoptic Gospels do not describe a gradual growth in understanding by the disciples, but a period of receiving and misunderstanding, followed after the Resurrection by a sudden insight into the real meaning of the teaching they had received.

### Interpretation.

The position of the episode of the cleansing of the Temple in the Fourth Gospel is the key to its interpretation. The Gospel opens with a series of events connected by an underlying interpretation of Christianity. After the Prologue, the writer describes the work of the Baptist, the call of the first disciples, the miracle of Cana, the cleansing of the Temple, and the discourses with Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria. That is to say, the statement as to who Jesus is, is followed by the record of the preparatory witness to Him by the Baptist, the call of the first disciples and the beginning of the Christian community, the changing of the water of Jewish purification into wine fit for a marriage feast; then, omitting the passage to be explained, the teaching about Christian Baptism as a new birth into the community which is the kingdom of God, leading to the clear statement to the woman of Samaria that the time of the true worship of God has come, which will have its centre neither in Samaria nor in Jerusalem. The Christians worship Him whom they know, and the Father is seeking to draw into the kingdom all true worshippers. Christianity, in spite of its Jewish origin, is thus presented to us as a community of worshippers who by Baptism have been reborn into the kingdom of God; and Christianity, because it is the Truth, has superseded the Jewish religion from which it sprang. The Fourth Gospel is an interpretation of Christianity and an explanation of its complete separation from the religion of the Jews. It is controversial, and yet the controversy never becomes undignified, because of the author's conviction that Christianity is nothing less than the Truth. On this background an interpretation of what is called the " cleansing of the Temple " is possible.

The prophet Malachi had said that, after the appearance of the forerunner, the Lord would suddenly come to His Temple as the

messenger of the covenant. His coming would be terrible, but He would purge the sons of Levi, and they would offer to the Lord a righteous offering. This was a *locus classicus* of popular eschatology. In the first chapter of the Gospel St. John had described the coming of the forerunner, and in the fourth chapter he showed that the hour of the true worship had come; in order, therefore, to fill up the prophecy he introduced the cleansing of the Temple between these two chapters to show that the Lord—Jesus—did suddenly come to His Temple; but he remoulds the prophecy, because as a matter of fact Jewish worship was destroyed, not purged, and its place had been taken by the new Christian worship of God. The merchants and money-changers were not driven out of the Temple because they were unworthy of the Jewish Temple worship, but because the Temple had ceased to be the centre of the worship of God, and animal sacrifice was needed no more. For this reason St. John carefully states that all the sellers of the sacrificial animals were driven from the Temple.

St. John does not in any detail describe the nature of the new worship, but his statement that the Body of the Lord would take the place of the old Temple must have been full of significance for his readers. The phrase "the Body of the Lord" was a current Christian expression, which carried with it clear and obvious associations, just as the phrase "Corpus Christi" does to a modern Catholic. His readers would understand by it the risen Body of the Lord, the Bread of the Eucharist, and the Christian community which formed the mystical Body of Christ, for it was the Temple of His Spirit. These meanings would, however, run into one another, since the Body of the Lord was one Body, and may be regarded as but various aspects of Christian worship. Its centre of Christian worship is the risen Christ, who is the Passover Lamb slain for the salvation of the world, but living to give His worshippers eternal life. But, because He who is the centre of Christian worship is in heaven, Jerusalem can no longer be the centre of men's worship. The Body of the Lord was, however, not thought of as only in heaven. In the great act of Christian worship, as St. John plainly says in the sixth chapter, the Lord gives His Flesh—Body—to be eaten, and by this feeding upon the Lord's Body the Christians maintain the life which they had received in Baptism. They feed upon the true Passover Lamb, and for this reason, again, Jerusalem has ceased to be the centre, for wherever the Christians celebrate the Eucharist the Lamb is with them. But St. John never suggests that worship is limited to the Eucharist; to him the whole life of the Christian community is the true worship of God, and the whole Christian community is the Temple of God, in which Christians live, possessing the knowledge of God and eternal life. They are the Body of the Lord because they possess the Spirit who

is not only sent by Him, but is actually His abiding in them. Under the old covenant God dwelt in His Temple at Jerusalem; now He dwells or abides in the Christians who are His Temple or His Body. The old Temple with its animal sacrifices and its crowds of pilgrims is at an end, not because it was destroyed by the Romans, but because God abides now in the Christian community, and not in His old Temple. Thus, the true worship of God can be practised only by entrance into the new kingdom, and not by pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

Since, however, the salvation which is mediated by entrance into the kingdom through Baptism, and by sharing in the life of the Christian community, did in its origin come from the Jews, the Christians took over and reinterpreted the whole Jewish literature and sacrificial system. The Old Testament was interpreted in the light of the coming of Jesus as the Messiah, and of the experience which followed the Resurrection. The Passover language was transferred from the lambs slain to the Lamb who died for the salvation of the world, and the Christian rites of Baptism and the Eucharist became the rites of the new worship which had taken the place of the old sacrificial system.

St. John, then, has two aims in his narrative of the episode which is so misleadingly called the cleansing of the Temple: firstly, he wishes to emphasize the destruction of the old worship by the Messiah who is Jesus; and, secondly, by his use of the phrase "the Body of Christ," he suggests to his readers the nature of the new worship, of which he speaks more definitely in the discourse with the woman of Samaria, and in the speech which follows the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand. The position of the episode in his narrative is conditioned partly by the prophecy from Malachi and partly by the sequence of thought underlying the opening chapters of the Gospel.

It remains to compare the account given of the same event in St. Mark's Gospel with that given by St. John. The accounts disagree as to chronology, for, while St. John places the episode at the opening of the ministry, St. Mark, and with him St. Matthew and St. Luke, records it as one of the events immediately preceding the Crucifixion. We have seen that St. John's motive in placing it at the opening of his Gospel was not to correct the inaccuracy of the older Gospels, but to show its true meaning. It is possible that St. John may here be using an independent tradition or the account of an eye-witness, in which the cleansing of the Temple occurred at an earlier period in the ministry; but it would seem more likely that he has, for the reasons stated above, made use of the incident when he required it for his own purpose. More important, however, than the question of chronology is that of the meaning of the incident in St. Mark's account.

The events of the week before the Crucifixion, as recorded by St. Mark (chapters xi.-xv.), are dominated by the open claim of Jesus to be the Messiah, and every incident he records bears clear relation to this claim. Jesus enters Jerusalem riding upon the ass, and is received by the crowds as the Messiah; He goes straight to the Temple, but, since it is evening, retires for the night to Bethany. The following day He enters the Temple, and not only drives out those who are buying and selling, but forbids anyone to carry a vessel through the Temple; that is to say, He interrupts the preparations for the Passover. The High Priests are frightened, and plan to destroy Him, because He is acting publicly as the Messiah. The next day they ask Him by what authority He is doing these things; but, when they are unable to explain the Baptism of John the Baptist, who was the forerunner of the Messianic prophecy, Jesus refuses to discuss with them further the question of His authority. Most significantly, however, He tells the parable of the wicked husbandmen, in which He shows that the High Priests will kill the Son, but as a result of this they will lose the vineyard, which will be given to others. Thus, the last week moves on irresistibly till Jesus dies, because He acted and taught in public as the Messiah, and refused in any way to modify His claim. "Again the High Priest asked Him, Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And He said: I am."

From this it would appear that the account of the event we are discussing is for St. Mark, as for St. John, no mere prophetic cleansing of the Temple. It is the coming of the Messiah to His Temple, where He foretells His own death and the subsequent passing of the kingdom of the Jews to others. It is clear from the evidence of the false witnesses at the trial that Jesus had said that He would destroy this Temple made with hands, and in three days would build another made without hands (Mark xv. 58). The importance of the so-called cleansing of the Temple, both for St. John and St. Mark, is that it is a Messianic theophany, which is the prelude to the death of Jesus, and an anticipation of the new worship of God based upon the Resurrection. There is no contradiction in the two Gospels, and no symbolic development by St. John of an earlier and simpler narrative. The accounts in the other Gospels need not concern us, for St. Matthew bases his narrative on St. Mark's, and St. Luke summarizes it.

E. C. Hoskyns.

# SURVEY OF RECENT POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

1. The Hope of Man. By the Very Rev. W. H. Hutton. Macmillan and Co. 5s.
2. Christian Freedom. By the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson. Macmillan and Co. 5s.
3. The Idea of Progress. By Prof. J. B. Bury. Macmillan and Co. 14s.
4. Thoughts on the Scottish Union. By A. V. Dicey and R. S. Rait. Macmillan and Co. 16s.
5. Germany and the French Revolution. By G. P. Gooch. Longmans, Green and Co. 14s.
6. Lord Grey of the Reform Bill. By G. M. Trevelyan. Longmans, Green and Co. 21s.
7. The History of Trade Unionism. By S. and B. Webb. Longmans, Green and Co. 21s.
8. Social Theory. By G. D. H. Cole. Methuen and Co. 5s.

The storm of warfare, which shook the foundations of civilized life, has brought to our sight once more old forgotten treasures. It has enabled us to realize the tie between the past and the present, the solidarity of the controversies of our day with those of the remotest ages. True, we are effecting enormous changes since the outbreak of war, but it is well for Dean Hutton to remind us that the age which saw the end of the Renaissance and the beginning of the Reformation witnessed changes at least as epoch-making as our own. Indeed, we are not sure that the generation which lived from 1492 to 1522 did not suffer greater shocks to their intellectual and religious outlook. Dean Hutton provides us with an able survey of the work of that brilliant son of the Renaissance, Pico della Mirandola, who endeavoured to harmonize the conflicting tendencies of his stormy day. The Italian thinker urged the reform of the Church no less than he urged the reform of sound learning in order that man might be worthy to become a citizen of the New Jerusalem. In practice he was as ineffective as Erasmus, bequeathing simply a lofty ideal. If, in accordance with Browning's test, we judge a man by his aspirations, he stands high in the philosophy of the sixteenth century. Dean Hutton travels back to the fifth century and to the fall of Rome before Alaric the Goth. St. Augustine pressed home the truth in his *De Civitate Dei* that we indeed seek a city yet to come. The conception entertained by the African saint under his circumstances is intelligible, yet the other-worldliness of the Christians of his time exposed them to the charge of being

unfaithful citizens. They were so occupied with the Word of God that they neglected the world of God. Here, indeed, lies the reason why the labours of men like Roger Bacon met with indifference. The world to come loomed so large in the imagination of men that they cared little about this world.

The Hulsean Lectures, which Mr. Hutchinson delivered in 1918-19, deal penetratingly with the conceptions of Christian freedom. The writer naturally sketches the ideas entertained by thinkers in the past, and his book, like Dean Hutton's, is a fine plea for the continuity of thought, especially of political thought. The cry of the political philosopher is, Back to Aristotle; of the mental philosopher, Back to Kant; of the scientific, Back to Newton; and of the theologian, Back to Christ. We are apt to forget that the scientific world is as anxious as any other to build on the past. For example, the views of Einstein run back to those of Descartes, a seminal thinker who receives adequate justice at the hands of Professor Bury. Continuity is, then, a quality of political philosophy. There is only one real break in its history, and that occurs in the time of Cicero, when the dogma of the equality of man passed from the study to the forum, becoming a practical force in politics.

Time was when theology was regarded as the queen of the sciences. Time, however, has altered. What concern, asks the reader, has a work like Mr. Hutchinson's with political philosophy? It has the deepest concern, for its author argues with Chateaubriand that " quand on commence à douter en religion on doute en politique. L'homme qui cherche les fondements de son culte ne tarde pas à s'enquérir des principes de son gouvernement. Quand l'esprit demande à être libre, le corps aussi veut l'être. Cela est une consequence toute naturelle." Free religious and free political life are inseparable. There is only one liberty, and it is liberty of conscience. All other forms of liberty are its offspring. Mr. Hutchinson lays stress on this, taking occasion to remark that the Church has not sufficiently emphasized the note of freedom present in Christ's teaching. He regrets that Lord Acton was unable to write his contemplated *History of Freedom*. Lord Acton, however, showed that he was deficient in architectonic ability when he planned a book which no single man could write. Such a history may be approached from the point of view of the growth of toleration, of the advance of Parliament, or of the growth of public discussion. In this fashion it may be written by a succession of scholars, but no other way is actually open.

Mr. Hutchinson dwells with insight on the work accomplished by our Saviour as the liberator of men, and he invests his treatment with freshness and force. Then he discusses the part taken by

St. Paul, and from him he passes on to consider the incompleteness of the Reformation as an emancipating movement. There is only one real defect in this book, and that is its size, which prevents a proper discussion of the Middle Ages. The author is perfectly well aware that these ages were more free and more varied in content than most people imagine. The pity is that he does not bestow space on matters on which he clearly has long meditated. In the appendix there is a thoughtful sermon on sincerity and truth, yet we could dispense with it for a consideration of the "ages of faith."

No doubt the Reformation was incomplete; so, too, for the matter of that, is our own age. We must escape from the illusion of finality which every age claims: such claims we must deny. At the same time we must not ignore the fact that the great reformers, Erasmus and Luther, Calvin and Lefèvre d'Étaples, inquired into the history of the past, thereby stimulating the growth of free inquiry. True, they builded better than they knew, and at least they gave others the possibility of building. Theirs was a strange, unforeseen destiny. Nor was it altogether singular. It is clearer perhaps in literature than in life. Take an example. Though Dante was a devoted Virgilian, men make of him a romantic. Dante was a convinced supporter of the monarchy of the world, and wrote his *De Monarchia* in order to commemorate the coming of its ruler in Henry VII., yet the supporters of Italian unity passionately invoked his name as the prophet of the national State. Nevertheless, the instinct was sound, for Dante, just as much as Mazzini or Cavour, eagerly desired to confine the papacy to spiritual matters. The reformers permitted the possibility of progress.

The idea of progress is in the air. Most of us are inclined to regard it as a matter of course. Knowledge expands, we think, and there is no reason why it should not continue to do so indefinitely. It is therefore with a start of surprise that we learn from Professor Bury's illuminating volume how new the idea really is. He brings forward powerful pleas for believing that the idea of progress could not have been grasped much before the sixteenth century, and that the first to work it out was Descartes. The classical writers were dominated by the conception of the Golden Age. In it happiness and innocence reached the highest possible stage: the utmost man can expect is to return, however distantly, to this stage. There was not with Plato and Aristotle what Wordsworth calls the sweet air of futurity. The *Atlantis* was lost to the sight of men in the depths of the sea, and the sole hope of man lay in its recovery. If anyone is desirous of understanding the originality of St. Paul's conception of the future the ideal method is to peruse a large selection of the classics. As one peruses them one wonders that all save

Seneca—his *Natural Questions* furnishes the outstanding exception —stop short at the very point which is of the greatest interest, the nature of the future. A perusal of the *Natural Questions* and then a perusal of the Epistle to the Ephesians enable one to grasp in some measure the originality of St. Paul. Indeed, the true idea of progress is a creation of Christianity, forming one of its finest achievements. It took generations before it affected the minds of men. "The die is cast," wrote Kepler; "I have written my book. It will be read, whether in the present age or by posterity matters little. It can wait for its readers. Has not God waited six thousand years for one to contemplate His works?"

As we turn over the folios of the writers of the sixteenth century we catch a glimpse of the Renaissance spirit of free inquiry. Do we remember sufficiently how long it was before this spirit of progress was destined to prevail? In political circles, as well as in literary and scientific, it was not rare to meet with the Stoic notion of the circular theory of the movement of peoples and civilizations. If on the one hand there are the names of Rabelais, Campanella, and Francis Bacon, on the other there are the no less renowned names of Machiavelli, Bodin, and Montaigne, who all scoffed at the conception of progress.

The leading feature in Professor Bury's remarkable book is the care with which he develops the decisive steps in the evolution of this conception. He insists on the place occupied by the two outstanding axioms of Cartesianism, the supremacy of reason and the invariability of the laws on Nature. It is obvious how greatly these two axioms helped forward the idea of progress. The age of law began with Descartes, for his doctrine of the immutability of the processes of Nature collided with the theory that chance ruled everything. Again, the weight of authority and the weight of tradition were thrown off by the brains of men who believed in the potency of reason. The myth of the Golden Age at last disappeared, and with it the theory of degeneration which it implied.

It is perhaps as difficult for us to be fair to men of the age of Descartes as it was for him to be fair to men of antiquity. That the historical sense was not awake in him is evident in his eagerness to ignore the achievements of his predecessors. No one can know the present who does not know the past, and much as Descartes accomplished for men, he might have accomplished far more had not the reaction against the classical authors rendered him unable to deal justice to them. The attitude of Pascal was sounder. For he held that the ancients "reached a certain point, and the slightest effort enables us to mount higher, so that we find ourselves on a loftier plane with less trouble and less glory." Nevertheless, Descartes' ideas were of incalculable service to men, though it took

generations before they filtered down to the minds of the average thinker. They compelled other modes of thought to pass away without direct proof or disproof. The day was to come when Fontenelle seized them, making them the mental atmosphere in which men breathed.

Professor Bury explores many of the side currents of history, and succeeds in showing their connection with the main stream. Take, for example, his fine estimate of the seventeenth quarrel on the merits and the demerits of the ancients as compared with the moderns. If Cicero wrote better, infinitely better, than (say) the writers of the siècle de Louis XIV., it is clear that the moderns must be degenerate. Nature is no longer capable of producing the men of old. The moderns vigorously controverted these ideas by putting forward the theory of progress, and as the controversy was one which engaged the thoughts of all educated men, it familiarized them with the conceptions of Descartes. Men like Condorcet explained that the nature of man tended to perfection, and eighteenth-century France was obsessed by the notion of man's perfectibility.

There were Englishmen like Priestley who waxed enthusiastic in their dreams of progress, but for the most part they were too practical to care deeply for them. When they desired reform they fell back on the ways of their forefathers They had a preserving revolution in the seventeenth century; they therefore had not a destroying revolution in the eighteenth. From this standpoint Mr. Dicey and Mr. Rait have produced a book of signal value. The historian will be interested in the details they give of the constitution of the Scots Parliament, of the enormous power possessed by the Committee of the Articles, a committee to which there was no parallel in England, though there was a parallel in Ireland in the Privy Council exercising the powers it possessed under Poynings' Law. The authors point out the fundamental changes effected in the Scots Parliament by the Convention of 1689, and its transformation during the next seventeen years. These matters are set forth with unsurpassed knowledge by the authors.

The books of Dean Hutton and Mr. Hutchinson are recalled to our mind as we note how steeped in matters ecclesiastical the Scots were in 1707. It is usual to remark that men fought for their faith before the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, but that after that date they fought for their pocket. There is truth in the statement, but a truth which must be modified in the cases of Ireland and Scotland. For the former country through its Penal Laws testified to the fact that Roman Catholics owed allegiance to the foreign sovereign who was also the head of their Church. The latter country at the time of the Union likewise demonstrated that there was as much care exercised in looking after their religious

liberty as after their political. Mr. Dicey and Mr. Rait have much to say on the fact that Presbyterianism during the greater part of the eighteenth century was among the mass of the Scots supported by two beliefs, and these were the absolute inspiration of the Bible and the revelation in it of a divinely appointed form of Church government. The authors furnish us with an excellent account of the connection between Church and State as conceived by the men of 1707, and this account is not without bearing on present-day affairs.

This bearing is peculiarly intimate in the third part, where the revolutionary and the conservative character of the Act of Union is set forth. It was revolutionary, for it brought about the complete political unity of the two kingdoms, the complete freedom of trade between England and Scotland for all subjects of the United Kingdom in the Dominions and Plantations belonging thereto, complete security for the Church of Scotland combined with the like security for the Church of England, and the transference of the Government of Scotland from a non-Sovereign to a Sovereign Parliament. These were four changes fraught with the largest consequences, consequences which we still feel. On the other hand, the conservative character is evident in the circumstance that there was no change introduced in England except the introduction of Scots representatives into the British Parliament. There were changes, but there were no changes save those absolutely necessary. The conservatism of the Act of Union is as clear in what it does not enact as in what it does. There were matters requiring reform in Edinburgh, but the authors of the Act of 1707 were studious to avoid everything except that which bore directly on their task. How different the men of 1789 were Mr. Gooch renders perfectly clear. The Scots are logical, the English are illogical, but the representatives of the two nations resolutely confined their attention to the points at issue. Mr. Dicey and Mr. Rait point out that the Parliamentary system of Scotland was kept in existence, and the arrangements as to the election of the representatives of Scotland were deliberately left to the determination of the Parliament in Scotland. The heritable jurisdictions and the rights and the privileges of the Royal Scots burghs were not obliged to conform to the Common Law of England. In France the best has been the enemy of the better, but this has not been so in Scotland and England. There the better has been adopted in the hope that some day it will lead to the best. The result has been to stamp compromise, common sense, on all alterations in our Constitution. Those who are alarmed by the threats of a section of the Trades Unionists ought to read the lucid book of Mr. Dicey and Mr. Rait. There they will see revealed the inwardness of the remark we heard an English working man

make: "We'll go a long way down the plank, but we stop short at the jump-off." There has been a long discipline, there has been a long history, behind the efforts of the British working man to gain political influence, and, in spite of threats of revolution, this discipline and this history have left an abiding mark upon him.

Sir John Seeley used to deny that there was a French Revolution in 1789, for he steadfastly contended that it was European. It was the mere accident that the French peasant was better off than other peasants which caused the outbreak in Paris, but the movement was essentially European. No one can read the learned work of Mr. Gooch without coming to the same conclusion. It is a book characterized by abundant knowledge and by—what is infinitely more valuable—clear insight. It is largely occupied with the writers of Germany. The author is careful to supply the background, thus avoiding one great weakness in histories of ideas. He brings out admirably the course of the relationship between the thought and the circumstance of the age. It is no easy matter, for the history of Germany from 1789 to 1800, the period with which Mr. Gooch deals, is confusing. Treitschke was perplexed by this confusion, out of which he endeavoured to reach a unity. The trouble is that there was no Germany, though the Holy Roman Empire nominally lingered on to 1806, when the rude hand of Napoleon dissolved it. Mr. Gooch analyzes penetratingly its fabric which had long outlived its usefulness. The Diet was as ineffective as the States-General of France in providing its members with political training. At the great crises of her history Germany has never lacked able men: she has sorely lacked statesmen with an intimate acquaintance of affairs. This is true in 1520 and in 1848, and it is just as true from 1789 to 1800. Klopstock and Schlözer no doubt form exceptions to this statement, but they are the exceptions which prove the rule. True, Gentz and Humboldt employed their vigorous brains on the problems which the European Revolution called into fresh existence.

Genius there has been in Germany at the end of the eighteenth century as in the beginning of the sixteenth, but it is genius which has had no opportunity of exercising its political powers. There was more of what is, curiously enough, called common sense in Edinburgh from 1696 to 1707 than in Weimar from 1789 to 1800. The gap between literature and life is often wide, but in the case of Goethe and Schiller it was a gap—in politics at least—which could not be bridged. When a man stands on the summit of a great Alpine peak the meadows and houses below become unsubstantial mist. Goethe and Schiller saw from a height, but—this is the tragedy of it—they saw dimly. They only obtained a glimpse when they required a view. That view they might have caught

in the rough and tumble of affairs, but not in the life of the recluse in Weimar. As Goethe himself wrote in 1790:

> "Es bildet ein Talent sich in der Stille,
> Sich ein Charakter in dem Strom der Welt."

How profoundly this "Charakter" was absent is clear in the words of Schiller: "Political and civic freedom remains for ever the holiest of possessions, the noblest goal of every effort, the axis of civilization; but this glorious edifice can only be built on the solid foundation of ennobled character. We must make citizens before we present them with a Constitution. Character is moulded by the rectification of ideas and the purification of sentiment. The former is the work of philosophy, the latter of æsthetics. Philosophy alone is insufficient, for it is a long road from the head to the heart, and most actions are determined by feeling. The most urgent task of our time appears to me to be the elevation of our sentiments and the moralization of our will; for much has already been accomplished for the enlightenment of the mind. Æsthetic culture is the most potent instrument in the formation of character, and it can be applied without the help of the State." The divorce of the views of Schiller —and of so many Germans then and now—from practical affairs is startling. Man is to be perfect æsthetically before he can become a good citizen!

We know no type of historical work with which we possess such keen sympathy as the masterly monography Mr. Gooch gives us. In the study of the influence of one country on another we learn much about both lands, and we see the closeness of one national life to another. Now that Mr. Gooch has shown the liberalizing of German thought by French, we wish he would turn his attention to the reverse process in Great Britain. For if the French or the European Revolution helped the cause of progress in Germany, it undoubtedly hindered it for more than a generation among ourselves. The attitude of Fox to the 1789 convulsion passed away, and was replaced by that of the younger Pitt. On the effects of the French Revolution in England we can glean much from the brilliant volume Mr. Trevelyan has written. In one sense it is a great biography of Lord Grey of the Reform Bill, and in another it is a penetrating study of the movements of thought in the England of the first decade and a half of the nineteenth century.

In the experience of the English-speaking race, about once in every three generations a social convulsion has occurred. The last occurrence was in 1832, and there were signs in the industrial world from 1911 onwards that, apart from the war, another convulsion was due. Laws and institutions do not readily adapt themselves to the altering needs of men, and in the process of the alteration

occur those changes whose genesis Professor Bury has so accurately traced. Human society is a living organism, working mechanically, like any other organism. It has members, a circulation, a nervous system, and a sort of skin composed of its laws and institutions. This biological comparison fails at one point, for in the case of the growing child his skin expands automatically. With institutions it is far otherwise. Their skin or envelope does not expand automatically, and is only fitted to new conditions by those painful and conscious efforts which we call revolution. These revolutions are usually warlike: this is obvious in the examples of Russia and Germany at this moment. They were peaceful in Scotland in 1707 and in England in 1832, when we were nearer to a warlike convulsion than we sometimes realize.

The whole world takes heed to the personality of Mirabeau and Sièyes, of Danton and Robespierre, but what does it care about the personality of Lord Grey ? His name is for ever associated with the peaceful revolution we call the Reform Bill of 1832, but who save scholars knows the man ? Thanks to Mr. Trevelyan we can all know him, but the world will persist in thinking a thousand times more about the men of the 1789 movement than about him. Napoleon once consulted the cleverest among the politicians who served him, earnestly asking him how long he thought his institutions would endure. " Ask yourself," was the answer, " what it would cost you to destroy them. If the destruction would cost you no effort, you have created nothing; for politically, as well as physically, only that which resists endures." It cost Mirabeau and Sièyes as little as some of our own theorists to compose a constitution, and their creations vanished, leaving scarcely a trace behind. Lord Grey was an elderly peer who possessed no wide experience in affairs. His intellectual powers were far below those of Mirabeau and Siè yes, yet he carried a measure which is still the foundation of our constitution.

The preserving revolution of the seventeenth century placed the Whig nobility in power till George III. ascended the throne. On his accession they lost their long tenure of office. The industrial revolution accompanied the titanic struggle against Napoleon which lasted twenty-two years. The face of England altered more in the generation after George III.'s accession than in all the generations from 1066 to 1760. England became the first manufacturing country in Europe. The manufacturers supplied the sinews of war. Monetary influence they possessed: political influence they did not possess. The North was fast becoming a centre of industrial life, and was for the first time of more importance than the South. The efforts of Lord Grey to give them office was seconded by able colleagues, though, as Mr. Trevelyan convincingly shows, these

efforts were mainly his. In 1832 the manufacturers received that place in the Constitution to which they were entitled. The old nobility admitted the new to a place beside its members. Fortunately for us the transition was comparatively easy because the younger sons of a peer are commoners. A nobility, in the Continental meaning of the term, we never had, and in 1832 we perceived the inestimable advantage of our peculiar form of nobility.

Lord Grey's Reform Bill was expanded in 1867 by the admission of the middle classes, in 1884 by the admission of the working classes, and in 1918 by the admission of women. Ours is the age of democracy, but its legal foundation was well and truly laid by Lord Grey in 1832. In 1894 Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb published their informing narrative of the growth of Trade Unionism, and their present edition carries the story to 1920. It is well to note in it that not a little of the talk of the miner and the Guild Socialist, like Mr. Cole, is old, very old indeed. Ninety years ago Owen proposed that the instruments of production were to become the property, not of the whole community, but of the particular set of workers who used them. We are truly sorry that Mr. and Mrs. Webb present us with an extremely one-sided version of the railway strike of September, 1919: it is a serious blemish on an important volume.

No one has set forth the conception of the State as sovereign so penetratingly as Mr. Dicey. Rude blows have been levelled at this conception by Gierke and Maitland from the historical standpoint, by Graham Wallas from the psychological, and from the ecclesiastical by that thinker whose premature death is a grievous loss to political philosophy, Dr. Neville Figgis. With the entry of the idea of the State as a *communitas communitatum* enters the possibility of that Guild Socialism which Mr. Cole persuasively advocates. We all sympathize with the idea of an army run by soldiers, of a navy run by sailors, of a Church run by Churchmen. In the past, however, the salvation of our land has been that we have not been a nation of specialists. The Scots Union was engineered by statesmen who were on the whole men of uncommon sense: Lord Grey belonged to this class. Mr. Gooch enables us to see that the French noblesse were as special a class as the Prussian Junkers, and the specialism landed France in the disasters of 1789 as surely as it landed Germany in those of 1918. The freedom Lord Grey conferred upon us is a freedom linked to the work of the men of the past. Our national life has been eminently an orderly one, and for order our greatest poltical philosopher, Edmund Burke, ever evinced the most passionate enthusiasm. "The liberty," he avowed in 1774, "the only liberty I mean is a liberty connected with order." That liberty has been our possession in the past, and if there be any deduction to be made from our annals it will be our possession in the future.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

# MISCELLANEA

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

We should be doing scant justice to the Lambeth Conference if we attempted in the present number to appraise, even in outline, the results of its deliberations. The reports and resolutions just published deserve study and thought which shall be commensurate with the world-wide prayers and expectations which have surrounded the sessions from which they issue. As the Bishop of Nassau has reminded us in a striking sermon, published in the *Church Times* of July 16, " in the dogmas or the resolutions put out by a council no absolute certainty as to rightness or wrongness can be reached at the moment; they have to be tested by the ' mind of the Church '; certainty as to authority comes with their after-acceptance by the Church, which acceptance may not be consummated for many years." The function of theology—and so of this journal—in this testing process is plain. It is to focus the " mind of the Church " upon the issues raised and the settlements or policies defined; to bring together opinion from different quarters and points of view, effecting synthesis where possible, but not cloaking real fissures of belief; and to note the progress made in the acceptance or the modification of the council's decisions.

---

With this object in view we intend to publish a series of " Lambeth Conference Reviews," to appear during the autumn and winter, upon the various groups of reports and resolutions. The following have already been arranged:

1. " Relation to and Reunion with Other Churches " (the Bishop of Zanzibar, the Dean of Wells, Dr. Cooper, Principal Selbie).
2. The Christian Faith in Relation to—
   (*a*) " Spiritualism " (Canon Lacey).
   (*b*) " Christian Science " (Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, F.R.S.).
   (*c*) " Theosophy " (Miss E. R. McNeile).
3. " Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality " (Dr. Mary Scharlieb, C.B.E.).
4. " The Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church " (Mrs. Paget).
5. " Development of Provinces in the Anglican Communion " (Professor Watson, D.D.).
6. (*a*) " Christianity and International Relations " (Viscountess Gladstone).
   (*b*) " The Opportunity and Duty of the Church in Regard to Industrial and Social Problems " (Dr. A. Shadwell).

Reviews of the resolutions dealing with missionary problems have not yet been arranged, but we hope to secure them in due course from overseas.

The purpose of these reviews is not to close, but to initiate, discussion; and we shall be glad to consider any articles which may be sent to us in supplement or criticism of their treatment of the several subjects. We believe that this journal will be of best service to the Church by being as representative as possible in the matter it contains. At the same time we shall endeavour to make our own position quite clear as occasion arises.

---

*Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi.* " Our Creed," says Father Tyrrell, " is the joint work of theology and devotion; of reflection and life." His own books, and especially the two which took their titles from the maxim

quoted above, were a commentary upon, and a development of, this statement. Behind all the intellectual reasonings and formulations of Christian thought, generating them, guarding them, checking them, is the even more momentous prayer-life of the Church; and it would be a sterile kind of theology which strove to attain truths of the mind in isolation from those of the soul. In that science the oratory—or should we say the sanctuary?—is the best laboratory. No knowledge of God is generically Christian unless it mediates charity and can be verified in the experiments of devotion; and, conversely, the energies of charity in prayer need the education of true belief if they are to function fruitfully and not in dissipation.

We therefore welcome the suggestion made at the close of the first article in this number, and invite the co-operation of our readers in giving effect to it. The need as there stated—and stated over two years ago, we may remember, by the same writer in his contribution to *The Church in the Furnace*—is one which all who have at heart the interests of popular devotion will have discovered for themselves. A small committee, centred in Cambridge, is being formed for the purpose of suggesting subjects and of sifting and co-ordinating contributions; and we have set at the Committee's disposal some space each month in the section of "Miscellanea" entitled "In the Spirit." We will undertake to pass on any material sent to us, and any testimony which may accompany it as to its having been already used and found suitable will obviously be of value. There will then remain the final test of use in many and diverse congregations, and the results of this process, which we hope will be communicated to us and so to the committee, will be carefully recorded and considered. The outcome should be the compilation of a corpus of devotion which should be of real utility both to present incumbents and to future revisers of our Prayer-Book.

---

The two articles on Synoptic questions to which we draw attention below are indicative of a tendency of which we are likely to hear more in the future. The analysis and attribution of sources in the first three Gospels had been the chief work and probably the most solid achievement of scientific criticism for the half-century and more which preceded the war. But it had defects. Preoccupation with the letter, necessary to the craft in itself, tended to obscure certain factors which were at work in and behind the formation of the Gospels; and in the very success which attended the critical arrangement of the material it was easy to forget the considerable amount—scattered, no doubt, but capable of being accumulated—which refused to fit in with any of the dominant hypotheses. It would be too much to say, perhaps, that the Synoptic problem will be reopened. Rather we should remember that it is not yet closed; and a fresh study of the Synoptic data, with emphasis laid on the human element in the minds, motives, and environments of the several Evangelists, may well lead to surprising results. We are probably no less suspicious than before of any claims put forward on behalf of infallible *residua* of historical truth; the doctrine of the irreducible *minimum* was at best a very double-edged sword. What is claimed to-day is that the "variations," as we may call them—the passages which have baffled co-ordination—should be given the fullest weight as being, equally with the rest, the fruit of inspiration, and representing real elements in the spiritual history of our religion.

But while the subject-matter of both articles is the variations observable even in passages where the Synoptic narratives seem to be in closest connection, different hypotheses are found to account for it. After touching

on Dr. Abbott's hypothesis of a later recension of Mark, Dr. Adeney assigns these variations to one or more of five causes operating in the individual Evangelists—viz., literary taste, critical emendation, constructive imagination, additional sources, and personal remarks and comments. The burden of Fr. Lattey's article, on the other hand, as its title implies, is that varying memory is mainly responsible for the varied phrases. He is undoubtedly right to remind us that the story of our Lord's life and words was taught far more often than it was read in early times. In different districts different oral traditions of identical matter would have prevailed—a fact which he aptly illustrates from liturgical use in England in the fifteenth century. In other words, the explanation of the data is to be sought not so much in the individual minds of the Evangelists as in the natural diversities of verbal teaching. Synoptic variations may thus be windows into the pastoral life of the first age of the Church. May we, perhaps, in the first Evangelist's explanation of the parable of the Tares, hear the replies of a catechetical class to their teacher.

---

We regret it has not been possible to publish the concluding article on "The Credentials of our Communion," by the Principal of Chichester Theological College, in this number. We intend to publish it later.

---

## RECENT ARTICLES OF INTEREST*

### 1. Philosophical.

"Man in the Light of Modern Psychology" (Miss E. M. Caillard). *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1920.

"Religion and the State" (Dean of St. Paul's). *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1920.

### 2. Biblical.

"Synoptic Variations" (Dr. Adeney). *Expository Times*, August, 1920.

"The Place of Memory in the Composition of the Synoptic Gospels' (C. Lattey, S.J.). *Biblica*, July, 1920.

"The Epistle to the Hebrews and Roman Christianity" (E. F. Scott). *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1920.

### 3. Contemporary.

"The Lambeth Conference" (Vincent McNabb, O.P.). *Blackfriars*, July, 1920.

"Anglicanism and Lutheranism" (Dr. C. T. Flöystrupp). *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1920.

"The Church of England in Canada and Reunion" (Bishop of Ontario). *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1920.

* A brief record of matter in recent periodicals which, by virtue of its positive contribution to knowledge and thought, or its bearing upon subjects treated of in Theology, may be of use to our readers.

## "IN THE SPIRIT"

### Dominus Illuminatio.

PSALM xci. 14.

THE mystery of the soul's discipline has always attracted the saints. It is intimately connected with all that richly developed experience which results in the saintly character. The secret of spiritual discipline consists in the relation of love to suffering, and the fruit of discipline is the triumph of love through pain and trial. The royal road to sanctity is the way of love, which leads the soul directly to God as its end. The care of the soul is not, then, how to escape suffering, but how to vindicate its love, whatever be the occasion. We should seek deliverance from the evil rather than from the fact of suffering, and the soul that preserves its love is not only unhurt by trial, but also perceives within itself a quickening of spiritual power. The understanding is widened to the conception of Divine deliverance. When God delivers a soul from its suffering, be it physical pain or spiritual conflict, His purpose is to confirm it in love. If on our part we are careful to preserve the integrity of love we shall not fail of His deliverance. "Because he hath set his love upon Me, therefore will I deliver him." There is a clear relation between the action of the soul and the action of God. It would appear that God regards our intention of love when He receives our prayer for His aid. He will save us because we are steadfast in love, because our love is "set upon" Him. That must mean that if our love be pure, we desire the accomplishment of His purpose more than present relief. Self-pity leads to unworthy prayer for deliverance; pure love inspires the desire for the fruition of all that we perceive is reserved for us in the wealth of Divine love. And God assures us, "Because he hath set his love upon Me, therefore will I deliver him."

X.

### The Word in Action.

#### Loyalty. To Brethren and to Self.

"But it was even thou, my companion,
My guide, and mine own familiar friend."—PSALM lv. 14.

It was the dagger of Brutus which cut the last hope from falling Cæsar. It is fitting that the epilogue to the Fourth Gospel should contain the rebuilding of ruined friendship. Let each man make his own meditation upon John xxi. 15 f. "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these do?" Peter was grieved because the third time His words were, "Art thou My friend?" Peter's thoughts flashed back to the night of denial, past the morning of forgiveness (Luke xxiv. 34). Is his loyalty still in doubt? No, it is on its trial again. Peter instinctively looks back, Jesus characteristically looks forward. This is the Synoptist scene before the Transfiguration (*e.g.*, Matt. xvi.) repainted after the Resurrection by the Apostle of Love.

The assassination of Julius Cæsar suggests, further, a possible conflict of duties. If our friend betrays, or seems to betray, our common country, which is it to be? The late Major W. Redmond, M.P., wrote to a political antagonist, "Never mind; you go in what you believe to be the straight path, I shall go mine; in the end we shall meet."

"More than these." These words fall out after the first question, for

there are properly no degrees in friendship. So does the word ἀγαπᾶν, which was always applied to John, after the second.

"Feed My sheep." Friendship should welcome a test; loyalty is essentially practical, especially after failure. (Compare W. H. Page at the Pilgrims' Club in April, 1917: "Friendship is not a matter of clasping hands and vowing mutual help. The most enduring companionship does not come of expressing mutual regards, but of a common struggle in some high and dangerous task.") Loyalty is infectious: that was Peter, beginning his task, in Acts ii. Many a pagan bystander has caught the faith of a martyr on the spot.

And loyalty is disinterested (Acts ii. 44). On the other hand, it is difficult to think of Judas apart from those pieces of silver. Avarice flourishes like a weed in the ruins of aspiration.

"Lord, Thou knowest that I am Thy friend." Cried Carlyle, "Know thee men that are to be trusted; alas! this is yet, in our days, very far from us. The sincere alone can recognize sincerity."

The shortage of loyal hearts was deplored long before the nineteenth century (Prov. xx. 6, R.V.):

> "Most men will proclaim every one his own kindness,
> But a faithful man who can find?"

Then, "Brethren, what shall we do?"

*Self-Examination.*—(1) Disloyalty in deed. Working against a friend or colleague behind his back. Was this why President Wilson requested Mr. Lansing to resign (compare Mr. Drinkwater's *Abraham Lincoln*)? (2) Disloyalty in word. Backbiting (Ps. lv. 22). (3) Disloyalty in thought (R.V. accepts Matt. v. 22 without the reservation). Indeed, to inquire into sufficiency of cause is as fatal to the Christian ideal as to count how often—Peter again! (Matt. xviii. 21). Often there is no cause—at least, the cause is the very depth of the relation: even the Gentiles knew as much. "He who loves the most is angered upon the least occasions" (Menander).

*Repentance.*—If you are wrong, say so; if you are right, speak out; you may be wrong after all. Christ knew that at the sound of His voice all the old ties would be intensely strained; Paul thought that they could be completely strengthened "in the Lord." And He connected human forgiveness with Divine worship: "First be reconciled with thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." So another Apostle combines orthodoxy and charity in one supreme commandment (1 John iii. 23). Close upon distrust of brethren comes doubt of God; for "God is love." Or, conversely, an age of indifference becomes an age of sedition; for "everyone that doeth sin, doeth also lawlessness" (1 John iii. 4). There is typical, if not historical, value in the oft-recorded fact that the enemies of Israel fell upon one another.

Y.

# REVIEWS

Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology. C. E. Rolt. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1920. 12mo. Pp. viii., 221. 7s. 6d. net.

With " mysticism " so much in the air as it is at present it is highly desirable that there should be a readily accessible trustworthy version of the writings which have been of such immense historical importance in providing the mystics of the Christian Church with their vocabulary and their general philosophical scheme. Mr. Rolt's translation of the two most important of these documents, the *Divine Names* and the *Mystical Theology*, is thus extremely timely, and is, moreover, on the whole exceedingly well done. The task is not an easy one for any translator, and for one living in a remote country district without access to libraries its difficulties must have been wellnigh insuperable. The style of " Dionysius " himself may be called abominable. He is curt just where intelligibility demands that he should be full and explicit, and intolerably rhetorical and verbose where he has nothing to say which could not be expressed luminously and succinctly in a sentence or two. It is no small triumph to have made decadent Greek rhetoric of the worst kind, as Mr. Rolt has made it, into dignified and attractive English. The state of the text is another source of difficulty. The " Areopagite " seems never to have been critically edited, and the text with which Mr. Rolt was inevitably forced to work, that of Migne's *Patrologia*, is a disgrace to everyone concerned in its production, editor, printer, proof-reader alike. The editor has left the absurdest corruptions in his text, his punctuation is intolerably perverse, and printer and proof-reader have combined to make matters worse by producing ridiculous errors in almost every line. Most of these blunders have been tacitly removed by the translator, though one notices a few places where the English rendering goes wrong from deference to the scandalous punctuation of Migne's edition. Probably these might have been corrected if Mr. Rolt had lived to supervise the publication of his work. Revision would, no doubt, also have afforded an opportunity for ridding the notes of what is, perhaps, their chief defect, the frequent occurrence of vague references to authors without precise citation. It is no help to understanding to be told to " compare " Origen or Bradley or Bergson, unless one is told precisely what utterance of these thinkers the commentator has in his mind. Still, justice compels the reader to remember both that with longer life Mr. Rolt would presumably have made many of these references more precise, and that exactitude of quotation is peculiarly difficult

for anyone working under the disadvantages described in the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson's *Preface*. In the main, allowing for inevitable occasional slips, the English reader who wishes to know what "Dionysius" means by his "negative theology" may quite safely take Mr. Rolt's translation as a correct representation of the Greek text.

I should not speak quite so confidently about the quality of the commentary afforded by the elaborate notes and the *Introduction*. Mr. Rolt seems to me here to suffer from the direction his studies had evidently taken. He does not know exactly "where to leave" his author. In general he seems to me to understand "Dionysius" himself quite well, as might be expected of one who was evidently familiar with the classics of Christian mysticism. His parallels from contemporary modern philosophy are also often suggestive, though my own feeling is that the resemblances on which he dwells are sometimes merely superficial. For example, like others, he is struck by certain coincidences between Bergson's language about *durée réelle* and the expressions used by "Dionysius" about "eternity" or by St. Thomas about *ævum*. What he forgets is that Bergson's *durée réelle* is a character of "Nature," being, in fact, just what Mr. Whitehead in his recent remarkable book calls "the passage of nature," and thus corresponds with what "Dionysius" and Thomas call "time." By "eternity" or *ævum* they mean something which is taken to be characteristic of "spirits," in express contradistinction from the "passage" of the "events" which make up "Nature." The apparent similarity of language must thus conceal a very real dissimilarity of thought. It is a minor matter that Mr. Rolt is rather fond of divagating into illustrations from branches of study in which he was clearly never really at home. One rubs one's eyes, for example, when he volunteers the remark that finite integers can be obtained by multiplying "infinity" by zero. "Dionysius" is not responsible for this unfortunate statement, but its occurrence in Mr Rolt's exegesis might prejudice a mathematical reader against the author in illustration of whom it is made. The serious defect of Mr. Rolt's commentary is that he seems never to have made any systematic study of the philosophy on which the whole doctrine of his author is based. Of course, he tells us in his *Introduction* that the metaphysics of "Dionysius" are Neo-Platonic, and come more particularly from Proclus. But when he goes on to ascribe to Plotinus, the great original genius of Neo-Platonism, a wholly mythical visit to the Punjab, and to speculate on the consequent possibility of Indian influence on Neo-Platonic thought, one begins to suspect, what the notes to the translation prove, that he had not prepared himself for his task by any careful study of Neo-Platonism. This is a matter of real importance for the following reason. Our

judgment on the whole value of the " Areopagite's " speculative scheme must depend on being certain whether or not his famous " negative theology " is the genuine expression of a real and vital personal experience of Divine things. If " Dionysius " is telling us of what he has himself lived through in the personal endeavour after union with Christ, then he speaks with authority, just as a great original artist or man of science speaks with authority when he tells us of the delights or the torments of the artistic or scientific life. But if he is only repeating at second or third hand a metaphysical or theological theory which has not grown out of his own personal experiences, his claim to authority is on the same level with that of a philosopher devoid, like Aristotle, of the artist's spirit to prescribe to a Shakespeare how he shall compose a tragedy. Now about many of the great mystics—Ruysbroeck, for instance, or St. John of the Cross—there can be no doubt that in the main they speak from a full and rich experience. But just because " Dionysius " was supposed to have laid down the theory of the mystic way once for all, when these great saints try to theorize they inevitably theorize on his lines. If, then, " Dionysius " knew little by experience of the saintly life, we have to reckon with the probability that his theories have really affected the mysticism of the great contemplative saints for evil by providing an intellectual frame for their utterances which is really inadequate. The possibility, at least, is open that " Dionysius " has from the first been an un-Christianizing influence on the Christian saints.

Mr. Rolt, in his *Introduction*, seems at times on the verge of recognizing this, but in the end accepts " Dionysius " as a man who speaks from the abundance of his heart. I think he might have judged otherwise if he had really known the writings of Proclus. It is significant that the whole philosophical and theological vocabulary of " Dionysius " is taken over bodily from Proclus. Passages in which Mr. Rolt found evidence of remarkable " psychical experiences " are, as a simple matter of fact, mere borrowings from Proclus's *Commentary* on the *Parmenides* of Plato. What is more, there is no evidence that the doctrine of Proclus itself was in any way the outcome of a deep personal experience. He was a man of great learning and, when he could forget his pet hobby of reading into Plato the fantastic theosophy of the so-called " Chaldæan oracles," great good sense; but his mind was that of a scholastic epitomizer and system-worker. Neo-Platonism as a complete " system of philosophy " owes a real debt to him; as a way to the saintly life its whole worth is due to the high spirituality of its great originator, Plotinus. I do not believe it any exaggeration to say that, so far as it is possible to judge, " Dionysius " is throughout " exploiting " at third-hand the spiritual experience of a saint at least two hundred

years older than himself, without a single addition based on any personal experience of his own.

This leads us at once to face the question whether the mysticism of " Dionysius " has any right to be called Christian at all. For my own part, I do not believe that it has. Plotinus was a true saint, and has much to tell us of the deep things of God, but Plotinus was, of course, no Christian. The very essence of Christianity is just what is wholly missing in him: " the word of the Cross," the doctrine that the final revelation of the Divine is given us in the life and death of the Divine Man who humbled Himself to the uttermost that He might " bring many " of His brethren " to glory." This is just what the Neo-Platonists never knew, and it is what " Dionysius " apparently never knew either. Mr. Rolt is alive to the absence of the " Cross " from his author's teaching, but he tries to put the best face on the matter by arguing, in effect, that we can easily add on this missing element to what " Dionysius " gives us. I do not believe things are as simple as all this. To me it seems rather that the omission of the " Cross " means that everything which is left is seen in a radically false light, and for that reason I find myself in sympathy with the cautionary remarks inserted at certain places in Mr. Rolt's *Introduction* by Mr. Sparrow-Simpson, as well as with the general tendency of scholars since the discovery of the real date and *provenance* of the " Areopagite's " writings to treat these works as more than half non-Christian. Apart from a few incidental allusions to Jesus, which have no bearing at all on the argument, I see nothing whatever in " Dionysius " which might not have been written by a Neo-Platonist who was an avowed " pagan." The history of subsequent Christian mysticism seems to me all through the story of a never wholly successful attempt to Christianize something which is at bottom quite un-Christian. Of course, I do not mean that mysticism as such is un-Christian. I mean only that there are many mysticisms, and that not all of them are compatible with the Gospel any more than all doctrines of ethics or all practical rules of life. This needs to be said to-day with some emphasis precisely because so many excellent persons are prone to assume that whatever lays claim to the name of mysticism must be the perfection of the Christian life. Yet we must not forget that " St. Satan " also has his " contemplatives." By comparison with the neglect of the *via crucis*—the way declared by our Lord to be indispensable for every disciple—it is a secondary matter that the technical " orthodoxy " of " Dionysius " should be rather more than doubtful. Still, the fact may at least be noted. It is clear that his few allusions to the " super-essential Jesus " make for a kind of Monophysitism which is really inconsistent with the ascription of genuine manhood to our Lord, and that what he has to say about the Trinity accords better with Sabellianism than

with any orthodox formula. It is curious that Mr. Rolt follows his author's lead so unhesitatingly in this last matter, committing himself completely, and apparently without suspicion that he is getting perilously near heresy, to the statement that the *personæ* of the Trinity are mere "appearances" of an "undifferentiated" unity. This seems to an outsider like myself very suspicious theology, and I am sure that it is very bad metaphysics. The ethical implications of such a doctrine are, again, manifestly dangerously anti-social. In fact, it directly encourages what the greatest Christian mystics have always sought to discourage: selfish solitary concentration on the "salvation" of one's individual "soul." One wonders that Mr. Rolt should never have asked himself *why* the doctrine of a merely "economic" Trinity failed to satisfy the Church.

Let me end by repeating what seems to me the fundamental truth about the "Areopagite." "Dionysius" is not a Christian, if a Christian means a man whose spiritual meat and drink is the life and death of Christ. He is not even a true mystic, if that means a man primarily interested in living a life which has God for its centre. He is a theorist, a theosophist, and at heart a non-Christian theosophist. The philosophical theory of the life of the Christian saint is not to be taken from his pages; it is largely due to his influence that the theory has still to be constructed. It cannot be constructed by mere borrowing from Neo-Platonism, because the central thing in the life of which it must be the theory is just that which was "to the Greeks," even to so saintly a soul among them as Plotinus, "foolishness." "Dionysius," in colloquial phrase, "gives himself away" in his very warning that his doctrine is a secret for the few. In Christ there are no Brahmins or Pharisees, and in Christianity there is no *discipline arcani*. The one Christian way to "union" is a way for all; there is no private path for a little aristocracy of "theosophists," or persons devoted to the cult of abnormal "psychic" states. The suggestion that there is is the "devil's" last attempt to seduce the soul into the deadly sin of pride.

A. E. Taylor.

St. Andrews.

---

Christ's Thought of God. Ten sermons preached in Worcester Cathedral in 1919 by James M. Wilson, D.D., Canon of Worcester. Macmillan and Co. 1920. Pp. 153. 5s. net.

The ten sermons contained in this little book are the message of one who looks back on a long life of honourable activity as a teacher and writer to the young generation who will have to deal with the old problems under the conditions of a new time. They were delivered in the vivid consciousness of the changes which the preacher has seen take place during his lifetime in the sphere of religious

belief, and of the unsettlement and perplexity from which at the present day so many of the young are suffering, especially after the experiences of the war. There is a human pathos in a message delivered in such circumstances, and it would be an ugly feature in a member of the younger generation if he listened in anything but a spirit of reverence to Dr. Wilson's statement of the faith which has sustained him personally throughout his long life-work. Whether they can accept or not Dr. Wilson's interpretation of Christianity and of the problem of religion, there is that in his moral fervour, his zeal for truth, his sense of the Divine in human effort and aspiration, which may well serve to communicate new energy and resolution to the will for good.

Yet even if spirit and personality are a more important factor in influence than the satisfactoriness of intellectual conceptions, the world needs also to get its ideas clear and adequate, and Dr. Wilson would be the last person to wish that his interpretation of Christianity should not be subjected to the freest light of criticism. Dr. Wilson was born into a generation in which a great revision of traditional beliefs took place in the Christian Church. Much that former generations had considered essential had become incredible to some of the most sincere and Christ-like of Christians. To others parts of the current teaching had become a grievous difficulty; their spiritual life was constricted and thwarted by the cords in which traditional authority bound them. It would be idle to attempt to deny that there were things in the current teaching which had to be got rid of. Even those circles to-day which represent the extreme of conservative orthodoxy are to some extent different from the orthodox a hundred years ago. One need only take down some of those old, leather-bound works of theology which still fill many shelves in some country houses to realize the distance which even the conservative amongst modern men have moved. The men who in the past generation championed the liberty of the Christian conscience from unjust constraint, who, in the teeth of obloquy and odium, boldly denied those parts of tradition which they saw to be untrue, did a work of clearing away obstructions for which we can never be too grateful to them. In that work Dr. Wilson himself played a prominent part.

The Broad Church continued to maintain that it was clearing away only rubbish, that the substantial fabric of Christian belief was unaffected. It must, however, be admitted that it is not always immediately obvious to a human eye what is rubbish and what is part of the fabric, and the Broad Church, by rejecting certain dogmas, created gaps which had to be filled up in another way if the essential belief and practice of Christians was to be supported. It was in filling up these gaps that the work of the Broad Church

is proving insubstantial and impermanent. Where solid structure was needed, it was apt to put in the lath-and-plaster of rhetoric or arbitrary exegesis. And Dr. Wilson's statement of his theology in this little book seems to exhibit the weakness as well as the strength of the school to which he belongs.

Its main thesis is that the essence of the Christian Gospel is the thought of God as a life or power immanent in nature, and taking in every human being the form of a struggle for spiritual perfection against the solicitations of the lower nature. The salvation brought by Christ consisted simply in His declaration of this Gospel. "Of course," Jesus was not personally identical with God (p. 60); His descent from heaven means just that God was shown in Him, "as life and reason are shown in all men, to convince men that they, too, are made in the image of God, partakers of the Divine nature, sharers in the Divine word" (pp. 44, 45). The fact is that, although Dr. Wilson's temper and his devotional attitude towards our Lord are recognizably Christian, His theology has no distinctive Christian character. It is nearer to Epictetus than to Christ. The truths upon which he insists were stated more clearly and explicitly by the Stoics than they are in the recorded teaching of Jesus. They are implied, indeed, as a substratum in the doctrine of the Christian Church, as they are in any reasonable theism; but it seems hardly possible, in the light of present-day historical research, to make the proclamation of these truths the main content or the characteristic feature of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. It is noteworthy that Dr. Wilson finds it easier to identify his theology with the teaching of Jesus, if the Fourth Gospel is taken as giving a better representation of that teaching than the synoptists. Yet even the synoptists can be made to yield the sense required by a bold exegesis. Dr. Wilson tells us that when Christ said that the kingdom of God would come "without observation," He meant it would come slowly; the figure used in the context is that of lightning! Dr. Wilson argues that the saying said to have been uttered by Christ before Caiaphas, "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man," etc., is incompatible with the idea of the *parousia* as a sudden, proximate event, and he says (p. 73) that "few sayings of our Lord have in the eyes of scholars stronger evidence for their genuineness." Wellhausen's comment on the passage (Mark xiv. 62) is: "This means, 'Yes, I am the Messiah, and I shall soon (Matthew appropriately adds ἀπ' ἄρτι) prove this by My appearance as Son of Man, so that you will yet live to see it.'" Wellhausen goes on to contend that the genuineness of the saying is on historical grounds extremely improbable. Canon Streeter, with regard to the same saying, points out that "the disciples were not present at the trial, and must have been dependent on the version circulated by His enemies" (*Oxford*

*Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 432). Dr. Wilson is himself an accomplished scholar, and his opinion on such a point may be as good in itself as that of Wellhausen or Canon Streeter; but if he means that the general consensus of scholars regards the evidence for this saying as exceptionally strong, that does not seem to be the case.

It may be doubted whether much light can be got from Dr. Wilson's book on the specific question, "What was Christ's thought of God?" but if we read it as a statement of Dr. Wilson's thoughts of God, we find certain truths of religion asserted with the warmth which comes from living experience, and the spirit and personality which speaks through these pages ought to make anyone who reads them a better man.

EDWYN BEVAN.

---

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, WITH INTRODUCTION, TEXT, AND COMMENTARY. By R. St. John Parry, D.D. Cambridge. 1920.

The Pastoral Epistles have come by their own in England in recent years. In 1917 Mr. E. F. Brown, the Superior of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, published a volume on them in the Westminster Commentaries, enriched with all the experience of missionary work. In 1919 Dr. Hillard, of St. Paul's School, issued an edition intended chiefly for clergy or ordinands, written in a bright, terse style, with happy illustrations from St. Chrysostom and George Herbert, excellently adapted for reading during the diaconate, or subsequently in Ember weeks by those who wish to revive the true tone of ministerial work. Now comes a scholar-like treatment from Cambridge, well adapted for the use of students. Though differing in aim and in the character of their contribution, these commentaries have two points in common: they all support the Pauline authorship of the Epistles, and they all emphasize the important fact that the main interest of the writer is ethical rather than ecclesiastical, that his chief concern is with the character of the Christian community, and only in subordination to that with the organization of the ministry. But it is only with Dr. Parry's commentary that this review is concerned, and for that there is little but praise to be said. Dr. Parry does not attempt to examine the external attestation for the Epistles; he scarcely ever discusses various readings in the text, though he has two interesting suggestions of his own: in 1 Tim. v. 3-8 he would rearrange the verses in the order 3, 4, 8, 7, 5, 6, 9; and in 1 Tim. vi. 7 he would read *οὐδ' ὅτι* for *ὅτι*, "not to speak of being able to carry anything out." He confines himself to an examination of the internal evidence and to exact exegesis. Dating the Epistles between A.D. 62 and 67, he argues that the evidence for the release of

St. Paul from the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. is adequate; and the evidence which he gives would be considerably strengthened if we may, with Dr. Gifford, assume that Rom. xvi. is a letter written after the imprisonment by St. Paul to friends whom he had made during it. He then examines the personal relations implied both as to the character of the writer and of his relations to Timothy and Titus, and shows how consistent they are with the earlier Epistles, and how natural and human they are for one who was delegating his work to others. The nature of this delegation is rather different in each case. Titus is little more than a temporary delegate, and there is no reference to his ordination. Timothy has been probably ordained for this special task, which is, in 1 Timothy, to do the Apostle's work in his absence in Ephesus and elsewhere—" he is called to an independent though co-ordinate exercise of the apostolate "; while in 2 Timothy he is regarded as " the residuary legatee of his office and work, maintaining in his own person the office of an Apostle "; but it is very doubtful whether after St. Paul's death anyone ever called Timothy an Apostle. The organization of the Church is examined, and it is held that there was only one official grade, the presbyterate: not only ἐπίσκοπος but also διάκονος describes function, not status; there are presbyters who have oversight and presbyters who assist and minister. This is ingeniously argued, but not convincingly; it is too simple, and does not do justice to the natural interpretation of Phil. i. 1, nor to the variety of ministry implied in 1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. iv. 11. If it could be established, it certainly would favour an early date for the letters. With the same end in view he explains the false teaching attacked as being mainly Jewish, and carefully examines the use of the words διδασκαλία, λόγος, πίστις, παραθήκη, minimizing the interpretation which points to a later date, and unduly anxious to interpret διδασκαλία as " teaching " rather than " doctrine "; πίστις as " faith " rather than a " creed "; παραθήκη as a task entrusted to Timothy rather than a deposit of truth. There follows a careful examination of the style and vocabulary; here, again, we feel that there is not quite an adequate consideration of the amount of similarity in the latter point between these Epistles and writers of the second century. All this introduction is interesting and valuable, but the chief merit of the book lies in the exegetical commentary: this has all the exactness which we associate with Cambridge scholarship; it reminds us of Westcott on St. John, or Hort on St. Peter, or (to take an Oxford example) of Wickham on Horace's Odes. The exact meaning of each case, or tense, or mood, or voice, the exact shade of each adjective, is brought out; there is a clear and subtle (perhaps over-subtle, considering that we are dealing with letters rather than treatises) tracing of the connection of thought with thought, and often great

felicitousness of phrase in translation—*e.g.*, "faith which makes no reserves" (*ἀνυπόκριτος*), "wealth must be put into currency in good deeds" (1 Tim. vi. 18), "to keep at white heat" (*ἀναζωπυρεῖν*) "untouched by the universal doom of man" (*ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν*), "the businesses which provide a livelihood" (*ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις*), "teaching harmonious with the whole truth, as a mason squares and cuts the stone for its place in the building" (*ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον*), "dignity" (*σεμνότης*). In a few cases the notes seem unnecessary explanations of what is quite clear; in a few rather inadequate—*e.g.*, we should have liked a fuller discussion of "husband of one wife" (1 Tim. iii. 2), of the exact meaning of the metaphor of "the pillar and groundwork of the truth," of *τῆς εὐεργεσίας* in 1 Tim. vi. 2, of the teaching of Hymenæus and Philetas about the Resurrection (2 Tim. ii. 17); again, is not *πρόκριμα*, "prejudice," "a mind made up beforehand," rather than "preference"? Does not all analogy tend to show that *τὴν παραθήκην μου* is "the deposit which I have handed over," rather than "a deposit handed to me"? Does not the context make "trustworthy" more likely than "believers" as a translation of *πιστά* (Tit. i. 6)? Does not the analogy of the titles applied to the Roman Emperors make it probable that "our great God and Saviour" (Tit. ii. 13) is to be applied directly to Jesus Christ? In one passage Dr. Parry gives a translation which is new, and which is well worth consideration. He explains *ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων* (2 Tim. i. 13) as, "Keep up constantly by your faith and love a representation, a picture, of what wholesome teaching produces." "His own personal character is to illustrate and represent the wholesome teaching which he has had from Paul." This is very attractive: it falls in with the stress frequently laid on life and character as growing out of true teaching and as adorning it; it gives a proper meaning to *ὑποτύπωσις*; it comes very close to 1 Tim. iv. 12, *τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν . . . ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πίστει*; yet the use of *ἔχε* is strained; it is hard not to connect the thought with the stress on handing on doctrine in 2 Tim. ii. 2; so that it is difficult to be quite convinced that this interpretation is right. But whether right or wrong, it is well worthy of careful consideration; and so are the notes throughout the whole commentary. It is always the work of one skilled in exact scholarship—perhaps a little too much dominated by thorough acquaintance with the best Attic Greek—always the work of one in full sympathy with the ethical and pastoral spirit of the writer. The book is very carefully printed; but on pp. x, xiv, clxiv, 103, Bartlett should be Bartlet; on p. 76, col. 2, line 20 from the end, Eus. should be Eur.; on p. 44, col. 1, line 5 from the end, a word is dropped out; on p. 83, col. 2, line 23 from the end, 5 seems to be wrong.

W. Lock.

THE LIBRARY OF PHOTIUS. Vol. I. By J. H. Freese. Pp. 243. (Translations of Christian Literature, Series I., Greek Texts.) Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London; The Macmillan Company, New York. 1920. 10s.

Students of ecclesiastical history, as well as students of classical antiquity, will be grateful to Mr. Freese for undertaking the considerable and far from easy task of producing an English version of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius. It is a work containing so much information about books of all kinds which were extant in the ninth century, and are not extant to-day, that theologians, historians, and philologists have frequently to consult it. Its range is so wide that a translator, especially if he adds notes as Mr. Freese has done, must have no mean equipment of learning. Four more volumes of text are to follow, and a sixth will contain a biography of the author, a bibliography, and an index.

The origin of the work is interesting. Photius and some of his learned friends, including his brother Tarasius, had formed a reading club, at which they read and discussed books of all ages and subjects —histories, romances, controversial treatises on theology, acts of councils, even grammars. Tarasius had been absent for a long time from Constantinople, and asked Photius to give him an account of the contents of the books which had been read while he was away. Photius engaged a secretary and dictated summaries of 279 books. These "summaries," of which the *Bibliotheca* consists, sometimes amount to little more than the title; sometimes they are long and full. In this first volume the most important notices of lost works are perhaps those of the *Persica* of Ctesias, the *Histories* of Olympiodorus, and the *Dramaticon*, the novel of Iamblichus. It is to be regretted that Photius and his circle confined their interest entirely to prose.

Mr. Freese makes the apposite remark that it would be difficult to understand the plot of the *Æthiopica* of Heliodorus from the abstract of Photius. The inference is that when we do not possess the originals we must beware of thinking that his summaries are adequate. And in this connection it is important to remember what he explicitly states in his Introduction, that he dictated from memory. If this assertion is to be taken literally, it was an amazing feat. I am not prepared to believe that it is true without reservation, or that he never referred, while he was dictating, to the books themselves (were they all in his private library ?) or to notes. But we must accept it as roughly true, and in using his work we must always bear in mind that his summaries were not made from texts open before him.

Another point to be observed is that a book was sometimes begun

and not finished. For instance, Photius has reproduced the contents only of the first two of the eight Books of Procopius. When we notice that in the case of the eight Books of Theophylactus Simocatta he has summarized the whole, we can conjecture the reason. The two first Books of Procopius are the *Persica*, and it was natural that the history of the wars on the eastern frontier, which it was still a matter of life and death for the Byzantines to defend, though against a different enemy, should be of much greater interest to Greek readers in the ninth century than the history of wars in Italy and Africa, which are the main subject of Procopius in his last six Books. Theophylactus, on the other hand, is altogether concerned with operations against Persia and campaigns on the familiar ground of the Balkan Peninsula.

A critical text of the *Bibliotheca* is needed. Recently some work has been done on the MSS., but it may be long before a new edition appears, and Mr. Freese was justified in not waiting indefinitely for the sake of light that may eventually be cast on passages here and there. His notes are intended for the instruction of the general reader rather than for the scholar, and they can be relied upon as accurate. But we can see that it was difficult to choose what to say and what to omit. One general criticism may be made. It is desirable to let the reader know in all cases whether the original exists or not. As a rule Mr. Freese states or implies it, but not invariably. For instance, in the case of the proceedings of the Synod of the Oak (lix.) the reader is left to find out for himself whether the acts are preserved elsewhere. It is a pity that some simple typographical device was not adopted, such as an asterisk placed before the number of a section, to indicate that the book is not extant. That would insure uniformity and save print. Could it be adopted in the subsequent volumes? A certain lack of uniformity may also be remarked in the notices of the authors; for instance, there is a list of the works of Arrian, but the two large extant treatises of John Philoponus are not mentioned.

A few particular points may be noted. It is misleading to describe a *referendarius* as "a sort of lord-in-waiting" (p. 32); the interpretation of *exarch* as captain (84) says too little; that of *primicerius notariorum* as chief of the secretaries (137) is vague, and suggests too much; the domestics of the fifth century were not palace guards (50, 138); and if a note is required on the Prætorian Prefects it ought to be more precise (136). Prosper of Aquitania wrote only one chronicle, not two or three (49), though he brought it repeatedly up to date. The island of Diu is not India (34). Mr. Freese ought not to speak of the site of the Hebdomon as doubtful

(85); its position on the Propontis is now definitely established; we know exactly where it was. Occasionally he is too respectful to the version of Schott; *rebellantibus* for *καταστραφέντων* (54) deserves no consideration.

These are trifling points. In producing this admirable translation Mr. Freese and the enlightened and enterprising society which is responsible for the publication are rendering a distinct service to learning.

J. B. Bury.

# NOTICES

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL: being an attempt to show that the existence of sin and pain in the world is not inconsistent with the goodness and power of God. By the Rev. Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester, Chaplain to H.M. the King. Longmans, Green and Co. 1920. 6s. net.

From Canon Green we expect a high standard of sincerity, earnestness, and plain, straightforward thought. Our expectations are not disappointed. The tone of this book is admirable, and the thought is at once clear in itself and expressed with such lucidity that no one can fail to follow it. If we criticize, we only do so because the book is good enough to deserve criticism as well as praise.

The philosophy of Canon Green is not unconnected with that of his namesake, T. H. Green. Each is an idealism based on Kant and strongly influenced by Platonism. In both the dual source is a root of weakness, for Kant and Plato will not mix, and each destroys the other. Canon Green is operating with two sets of conceptions: the Kantian or idealist group—the human spirit as self-creative and creative of its world, the good-will as the only unqualified good and as an end in itself, the synthesis a priori; and the Platonic group, the doctrine of a purpose for which a thing exists, of an ideal human nature "laid up in heaven" (p. 43), and of an originally given perfection towards which human evolution is orientated as its goal.

Now for Canon Green—as for T. H. Green—it is an effort to live up to the Kantian point of view. Platonism comes more naturally, and Kantian idealism is only invoked from time to time to make good the obvious defects of the Platonic point of view. Thus, the main doctrine of the book is that the creation by God of free human beings entails the risk of sin, and that so long as free human beings exist God cannot prevent them from sinning. The relation here implied between God and man is a purely external relation, just like the relation between one man and another—a relation between two empirical facts, not the relation between finite fact on the one hand and infinite spirit on the other. The infinite is hypostatized into another finite, as with Plato; and this gives an easy escape from the problem of sin, which is paid for when one comes to deal with the conceptions of Incarnation and Atonement—conceptions lying outside the scope of this volume.

The difficulty recurs in the most original and fascinating part of the book, the theory of the Fall, which deserves a fuller discussion than we can here give it. The fundamental idea is that (just as for Descartes the conception of a finite being presupposes the conception of an infinite being) the state of sinfulness presupposes a state of perfection. Further, the root of sin is the assertion of individuality; the state of humanity before the Fall was a state in which the distinction of "me" and "you" did not exist. This interesting and profound suggestion is evidently based on the Kantian distinction between the "transcendental ego," in which man is identified with his fellow-man and with God, and the "empirical ego," in which I am not you and you are not I. Before the Fall, the self of man was the transcendental self; after, it was the empirical. This is to conceive the transcendental and empirical selves as alternative modes of empirical existence—two parallel finites, once more, instead of finite and infinite. The idealistic position is not really grasped, and the result, if worked out, would be a series of difficulties not unlike those in Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*, of which the author seems to be unconscious.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

THE DIVINITY OF MAN. By Reginald Wells. London: Macmillan. 1920. Pp. x+286. 7s. 6d. net.

The most appealing part of this book is the postscript. In it the author, after mentioning that he has retired from his official positions in the ministry of the Church of England, states the main principles of his own belief with a modesty and a restraint in his criticism of the views of others which come pleasantly after the lack of wisdom and proportion observable in too much of the preceding writing.

The first part of the book is mainly concerned with creation and God's relation to it. Mr. Wells emphasizes to an extreme point the doctrine of Divine immanence, though he intends to preserve the Divine transcendence. Creation is "quality displayed in form," and form apart from quality "is sheer nothingness." The world is both made by God and made of Him "because there is nothing else of which it can be made." God, the Perfect Self, is always expressing Himself in creation, especially in man, where the level of self-consciousness is reached. And "Duty or Christ is the manifestation of the true nature of perfect Self to Self as He is trying to express Himself in man." (In the postscript he says that he "believes the Lord Jesus to be God," but that the divinity of all men differs from this in degree only, not in kind.) Of this philosophical section I would say that the author tells us with the greatest confidence very much more about God than it is possible for anyone to know. How, for instance, can he possibly know that but for the imperfection which comes in creation, God "would have no experience of His own nature; His very perfection would prevent Him from enjoying Himself"? Aristotle, in the *Metaphysics*, is equally confident on the other side, and his argument seems more reasonable than that of Mr. Wells.

Secondly, Mr. Wells is far from satisfactory in his treatment of evil. Evil is form without quality—that is, nothingness, unreality. If God is "perfection of Being," and if God "is everything," that would seem to follow. But this involves precisely that identification of the Absolute with the Real against which Professor Taylor warned us in the July number of THEOLOGY, and makes it impossible to maintain God's moral perfection. Mr. Wells is quite outspoken: Man is to blame for his sins, but God also. "God allows man to delude himself, and therefore God is to blame for all the sins that man commits. Of course God is to blame, for the salt in man is God."

In the third place, Mr. Wells has no clear doctrine of human personality. "The salt in man is God" is one statement. "God dwells in all men" is a second, not obviously the same. And a third is that "a man" is "free to choose between God and nothingness." Who or what is the "man" who thus chooses? It is illuminating in this connection to be told, with regard to the life to come, that the writer "does not profess to know what is meant by continuity of personal identity"; his own conviction is expressed in the statement that "men are—and will be after death, the writer believes—the living cells of God's Body."

The second and third parts deal with "The History of Religion" and "The Needs of our Present Time." Organized Christianity has developed through the taboo system of primitive man; through idol-worship, which he carefully and interestingly distinguishes from idolatry; through Catholicism and Protestantism, and should in the future find expression in a more perfect system capable of voicing the religious aspiration of society. In England that should take the form of a truly national Church, demanding no creed as a test of membership or office except that which is the creed of the "true Catholic Church," which is "all humanity"—namely, that

a man should act on the belief that the world has something real about it and do his duty. The needs of society would be met by a representative priesthood, elected, episcopally ordained, unpaid. Serious interest would be taken in the religions of other countries, but missionary work as we know it would come to an end.

The latter parts of the book are in close logical connection with the first. Granted "the Divinity of Man" in Mr. Wells's sense, and the rest follows naturally enough. What he has not grasped is the meaning and relevance of the principle of distinction, not as between reality and unreality, but within reality. If he would do that, and criticize his own writing more severely than he criticizes anything else, he has the ability to produce something a good deal better than the present work.

J. K. Mozley.

---

A Handbook to the Septuagint. By Richard R. Ottley. Methuen and Co., Ltd. 1920. 8s. net.

This volume will be welcomed by many students, and especially by the increasing number of those who are turning their attention to the oldest translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. It aims at a popular and not too technical treatment of a somewhat complicated subject, and is the work of one who is no indifferent authority. Did not Mr. Ottley assist the late Professor Swete in his *Introduction to Old Testament in Greek?* No better book could have been written than this for stimulating the aspiring student. It begins at the beginning, and requires only a fair knowledge of Greek and of the Old Testament; and Greek scholarship is not yet dead in England, in spite of the abolition of compulsory Greek in University examinations. It is well that a new generation of scholars should arise to carry on the work of their learned predecessors who have passed away. All theologians deplored the untimely death of Professor James Moulton, who died in consequence of his homeward-bound ship being torpedoed in the Mediterranean by the Germans. Professor Swete's labours are known to all, and his death was a serious blow to scholarship; but the modern student has great advantages over his predecessors, and the work of the last fifty years has enabled him to make great advance in Septuagint studies. The Cambridge *Old Testament in Greek*, by its textual accuracy, has given a considerable impetus to the study, though many years must elapse before it is completed. Neither has Oxford been idle. The late Drs. Hatch and Redpath produced at the close of the last century the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint, a most trustworthy guide; and Canon Charles has published through the Clarendon Press two large volumes upon the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, with introductions and notes, critical and explanatory. Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray, the learned son of a learned father who has just passed away, has written largely on the subject; and many other names might be mentioned, both English and foreign, of men who are working on his subject. The author tells us that "in some departments the present workers have had no predecessors. The discoverers and examiners of papyri are exploring ground hitherto untrodden; the study of the κοινή, its vocabulary and its grammar, has assumed an entirely new aspect. Many documents and fragments of great value, either unsuspected or thought to be hopelessly lost, have been recovered and made known; and the accumulation of this new material has not hindered the general connection and consolidation of the study. The ground has been steadily cleared, and there is good hope of a considerable advance towards what all desire—an improved, if not a perfect, text of the Greek Old Testament, and

an understanding of it and of the numerous books that are more or less nearly connected with it."

This book will inform the student concerning the early history of the Septuagint, the causes of its neglect and the blank of a thousand years, the gradual revival of its study at the Renaissance and the continuance to the present day. He will learn something of the character of the translation, the language and style, and its immense value. The New Testament writers all use it; except in St. John's Epistles, quotations from it are very numerous, and also in the writings of the Fathers. Mr. Ottley gives useful hints for study, tells of the MSS., and furnishes a glossary for reference. The four oldest copies of the Bible in Greek are housed in the principal libraries of Rome, London, Paris, and Petrograd. We wonder what has become of the last. We trust it is somewhere safely buried and hidden away from Bolshevist iconoclasm. We have to thank Mr. Ottley for a very useful book which will inspire many to pursue their studies in a subject which he has made his own.

P. H. DITCHFIELD.

---

THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM. A course of lectures delivered by the late Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., F.B.A., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, St. Martin's Street. Pp. 213. 7s. 6d. net.

The *pietas* of the Bishop of Gibraltar and Mrs. Knight in publishing this course of lectures has given us a book of great interest and permanent value. Unlike some " posthumous " works which contain large editorial additions, this is printed as Dr. Swete left it. The lectures were all written out with minute care before delivery. The language is clear and simple, delightful to read, as it must have been delightful to listen to. The exegesis is judicious and practical. And behind all is the wide learning, the unfaltering faith, and the deep spiritual earnestness of the scholar who habitually lived near to God.

The book falls naturally into three divisions, the first treating of the Galilean parables (" parables of life, growth, and issue "), the second of the Judean parables (" parables of social life and conduct "), the third dealing with topics briefly touched upon in the body of the work. There is also an Introduction containing a brief discussion of the difficulty of our Lord's words in Mark iv. 11 ff., which men like Jülicher and Schmiedel think impossible in His mouth. " The parables," says Dr. Swete, " must have veiled the truth from those who were not ready to receive it." Perhaps, however, Burkitt is right in suggesting (*Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 85 ff.) that the people were so obsessed by the idea of a catastrophic coming of the Kingdom that they closed their ears to the teaching of the Parable of the Sower, which speaks of its slow and quiet growth. They had ears to hear, but they would not hear.

It is not easy to treat a well-known theme like the parables in a fresh and suggestive manner. But Dr. Swete has done this. He brings vividly before us the circumstances in which each parable was spoken, and makes the scenes and characters of the stories live. Points which escape the notice of most readers are brought to light (pp. 78, 120). Attention is called to important differences between parables which at first sight seem similar (pp. 56 ff., 78 ff., 136 ff.). There are warnings against losing sight of the main lesson of a parable, and against expecting that " the details of a story will always find an exact counterpart in the Kingdom of God " (pp. 47, 103). Parables must not be isolated. Sometimes " there is need of a complementary parable, or more than one, to set forth aspects which

the first one necessarily overlooks" (pp. 107, 147, 148, 152). The practical bearing of a parable on the life of to-day is carefully indicated (pp. 73, 74, 95, 130, 142). This section concludes with a note on the distribution of the parables among the Synoptists. Most of them are found in the Gospel of St. Matthew—a Gospel "saturated with the conception of a world-wide Messianic kingdom."

In the Appendix the significance of the phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" is discussed (*cf.* pp. 5 ff.), and there is a suggestive note on the way in which our Lord speaks of Himself in the parables as indicating the nature and extent of the claims He makes for Himself in the Synoptists (p. 173). There are also notes on the final issues of evil and the eschatology of the parables. The parables teach "a graduated scale of future punishment." But "dogmatic assertion on the subject of *αἰώνιον πῦρ*" is to be deprecated. The Parable of the Pounds (Luke xix. 11) "expressly discourages the idea of an immediate *parousia*." The end "in several parables is distinctly connected with the completion of a long period of time" (p. 200). But the difficult problems of Mark xiii. (=Luke xxi., Matt. xxiv.) and the further difficulty that the early Church, and "perhaps" St. Paul, looked for a speedy *parousia*, are stated without being fully discussed. This is disappointing. The book is beautifully printed on good paper. On p. 22 the Greek is defective in lines 12 and 15.

H. W. Fulford.

---

The Most Holy Mother of God in the Songs of the Eastern Church. Translated from the Greek by the Rev. G. R. Woodward, M.A. Faith Press. 1919. 156 pp. 6s. net.

The study of literature devoted to Our Lady has been strangely neglected by the English Church since the Catholic Revival, and Mr. Orby Shipley's *Carmina Mariana* were finished in the Church of Rome. It could be wished that some scholarly community would devote itself to a really comprehensive *Anthologia Mariana* of our language; the materials are now for the first time accessible in full, for the ages when such poetry was being produced in quantity, by the great Inventory of English devotional poems of the twelfth to fifteenth centuries now being compiled—it is already in course of publication—by Professor Carleton Brown for the Bibliographical Society; this index gives the first and last lines, and the exact place in the manuscript, of every scrap of English religious poetry of those ages preserved in public libraries, and in not a few private collections, and it will be of as much help to the student of religious literature as to the linguistic investigator.

But a collection of every poem addressed to, or about, the Blessed Virgin Mary in its original English will only be the beginning of such an Anthology; further volumes will treat of her praise in Latin, Greek, and the Oriental languages, and should supply translations for those unfamiliar with the original tongues. Here such a book as Mr. Woodward's will be priceless; he has looked through the great service books of the Greek Church, and from among the many thousand hymns on the Virgin to be found in them he has selected 136, and has translated them with skill and taste.

He rightly affects a certain quaintness of phraseology in his versions; his book begins—translating a troparion Οἱ *θεῖοι σκιρτήσατε Προφῆται*—

> Ye Bards inspirèd, skip for mirth
> In honour of this Maiden's Birth.

The sometimes remote imagery by which expressions in the *Canticles* and the Prophets serve as types of the Virgin would sometimes sound strained to our ears if they were not couched in slightly archaic language, recalling the Authorized Version or the Fathers.

The volume concludes with a useful glossary, which explains to the English reader some of the difficult technical Greek liturgical terms and names of books. A little help is needed with such a sentence as "The imperative Exaposteilon occurs in several of the Photagogika, which take the place of the Exaposteilaria during Lent"! But the book as a whole is suited to the simplest scholars, and every lover of Our Lady, whether learned or rude, will be grateful to Mr. Woodward for introducing him to charming songs hitherto known only to the small band of researchers into Eastern liturgiology.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

---

THE PROBLEM OF REUNION. By Leslie J. Walker, S.J.

Father Walker has been a chaplain during the war, and realizes the grievous damage inflicted on the Christian religion by the differences of those who profess to teach it. He approaches the problem of reunion with the utmost charity for those who reject the teaching of what he believes to be the one true Church, and is anxious to offer his assistance to them in their labours for the unity of Christendom. He is ready to admit that the responsibility for its divisions rest to no small extent on the sins and shortcomings of the mediæval Church, to the exaggerated emphasis laid by her on certain doctrines, and the distorted forms in which she presented those doctrines in much of her popular teaching.

On the other hand, he urges that Protestantism has failed. Its appeal to Scripture was based on a misconception of the object of the sacred writings, which without a Church to interpret them can only be a source of dispute and division. Modern Protestantism has abandoned many of the specific doctrines of the Reformers, and it is clear that it has failed to produce righteousness on a larger scale than the unreformed Church. Meanwhile Rome has thrown off her errors and reformed her abuses; and since the authority of Scripture has perished in the fires of criticism unless it is upheld by the voice of the Church, Rome alone can offer a guarantee for the permanence of that specifically Christian righteousness which it was the object of the Reformers to secure.

Accordingly Father Walker suggests that the Protestant bodies will have in the first place to reunite among themselves. The largest of them, the Anglican Church, can play a leading part in the matter. Although the Anglican Church has no real claims to stand for Catholic faith or order, she has preserved something more like it than any other Protestant body. This reunited Protestantism can then prepare to submit to Rome, with the certainty that, subject to the acceptance of the Catholic faith and order, Rome will be prepared to make wide concessions in liturgical and disciplinary details.

It is, however, unfortunate that in considering historically the position of the Anglican Church Father Walker is content to accept the conventional account of the English Reformation given by historians of his own communion. Thus it is pointed out that the official Anglican pronouncements deny that there is a Sacrament of Order, and profess only to regulate the practice of the Church of England. But no explanation is given of the fact that those orders were so scrupulously regulated in accordance with Catholic tradition that it was necessary for Leo XIII. to invent a doctrine

of intention hitherto unheard of in Christian theology in order to condemn them; nor is there any explanation of the motive which led the Anglican Reformers to be so scrupulous in excluding those who held only the orders of Continental Protestantism from exercising them in England. Similarly we have the hackneyed account of Ridley's irreverence towards the Sacrament of the Altar; but no allusion is made to the substantial orthodoxy of his beliefs as to the Sacrifice of the Mass as revealed in his correspondence and the proceedings at his trial, nor to the vagueness of the Catholic theology of the period on the subject. Perhaps the most striking instance of Father Walker's method of historical consideration occurs on p. 75, where we read that the Parliament of 1661 " refused to adopt the reforms (demanded by the Puritans), and not only enforced the Prayer-Book, but demanded unfeigned assent and consent to its contents from all ministers. As a result, the Free Churches gained by the accession of two thousand of the Anglican clergy." Of the fact that the bulk of those who seceded were intended ministers who had not received episcopal ordination, and that the main reason for their secession was the demand that they should submit to such ordination, no mention is made.

As a critic of Protestantism Father Walker is charitable and accurate; as a critic of Anglicanism he simply repeats a lesson he has learnt by heart without trying to investigate the truth. As against Anglicans who uphold the complete doctrinal and disciplinary system of Rome in its ultramontane fury his arguments are indeed conclusive; but that view, which threatened to become fashionable a few years ago, is now almost extinct. As against the general Anglican position as maintained by the Caroline and Tractarian theologians, Father Walker can only bring the old arguments that the Church must, irrespective of human sin, always be outwardly and visibly one, because our Lord desired it; that the claims made by Rome and the East to be exclusively the Catholic Church are fatal to Anglican theories of the Church; and that decisions of Councils have always derived their validity from the fact that they have received the approval of Popes.

We fear that Father Walker's book, though gratifying as a symptom of a real desire to understand and conciliate those not in communion with the Holy See, provides no basis for reunion. Until Rome will revise her doctrinal claims in the light of history, instead of forcing historical facts to suit preconceived dogmatic claims, we see little hope of unity.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

---

SOPHIA MATILDA PALMER, COMTESSE DE FRANQUEVILLE, 1852-1915. A Memoir by Lady Laura Ridding. London: John Murray. 1919. 381 pp. 16s. net.

All through life it was the happy privilege of Sophia Palmer to make friends wherever she went. And now, through the means of Lady Laura Ridding's admirable biography of her sister, this circle of friendship bids fair to be widened indefinitely. It is a vigorous and gifted, yet at the same time very human and lovable, personality which these pages so vividly reveal. The daughter and constant companion of one of the greatest and certainly the most justly revered of the Lord Chancellors of modern times, continually thrown into contact with many of the most remarkable figures—intellectual, social, political—in the upper-class society of a remarkable age, she never failed to leave her impress upon any circle in which she moved. A woman who in her twenties frequently enjoyed the rather awful privilege of being Tennyson's companion in long " walks and talks " upon " Immortality " and such-like subjects, for whom a small dinner-party including Browning, Tennyson, Dean Stanley, and Mr. Lecky

amongst its guests was an experience hardly out of the common, who in her later years found herself called upon to entertain the entire French episcopate together at her husband's magnificent château in Passy, certainly required great qualities both of mind and heart to do justice to her environment. This ability to rise to the occasion seems, however, never to have failed her. The secret of her power lay in a mingling of rare self-confidence with rare sympathy. Lady Laura speaks of her sister's "sublime assurance." It is indeed impossible to imagine any situation to which she could have conceived herself unequal. She was entirely sure of herself—both in opinion and in action. Her dogmatism was intense, at least on subjects on which she "held views"; and within these limits (though not beyond them) she claimed a full measure of that "infallibility" which she so resented in Mr. Gladstone after that statesman's precipitous fall from the pinnacle of adoration on which she had once placed him. She was quite frankly a partisan. Once her loyalty was touched, there could be for her but one side to a question. Of shyness she appears to have been incapable even of forming an idea. Her "head-on" attempts to make friends with M. de Franqueville's anti-clerical neighbours at Bourbilly were highly amusing. They seem also to have been surprisingly successful. This self-assurance occasionally led her, indeed, into blazing indiscretions; but one suspects that even out of the most embarrassing situation she would still contrive to emerge with colours flying. A character marked by such combativeness and self-will might easily have been almost repellent if these qualities had not been tempered by others. But in Sophia Palmer's case they were united with a rare capacity for love and unselfish service and with a most profound and ardent spiritual aspiration. She was ever one of the hungry souls. "I do long for more power to love," she wrote to a friend; and her devotion to her mother and father was not far this side of idolatry. Even in the busiest and most brilliant period of her social career she worked assiduously in the slums of London or (with singular success) among the labouring folk of her father's Hampshire estate. She was passionately devoted to the Church of her baptism, and (true daughter of her father) worked indefatigably in its defence through a most critical period of its existence. Her marriage to a devout Roman Catholic husband and rare opportunities of knowing the French Church on its best side never for a moment shook her stanch Anglicanism. This love of the Church no doubt owed something to her intense native conservatism; yet its real root was profoundly religious. Her faith was the very core of her being; and indeed without the discipline which came to her through it, how could her proud, passionate heart ever have been tamed? Suffering, too, was not spared her; yet it only served to purify and strengthen the fine ardour of her soul. Her favourite saint, we are told, was Catherine of Siena. We intend no idle compliment when we say that not a little of the saint's character was reflected in that of her devotee.

---

A Short History of Education. By Professor J. W. Adamson. Cambridge University Press. 1919. 350 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

As the author explains in his Preface, "the history of education is best narrated under national forms, an arrangement which is also convenient for study and indispensable for research." His object is to "set forth briefly the progress of English educational institutions, taking account of such domestic and foreign conditions as have a direct bearing upon English education. All Western education to-day bears the impress of two great powers, the Roman Empire and the Christian Church; and

through these a third power, the intellectual life of Greece, has operated. The fact gives a certain unity to the education of Christendom which is the more striking in times when the various nations were less self-conscious than they are to-day. The earlier chapters . . . are therefore less specifically English than the later. But, beginning with the fifteenth century, the narrative becomes increasingly English in its survey."

This announcement does meagre justice to the broad outlook on European movements which Professor Adamson maintains in dealing with the medieval period, notably in his chapter on the rise of Universities, and again in discussing the influence of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the conflicts which then and later developed round the principle of religious uniformity. The value of cross-reference appears continually in the survey of secondary and higher education, as also in his study of the genesis of "elementary" instruction, of the English attachment to private enterprise (which owed much, indirectly, to restrictive "Church and State" policies), and of the gradual evolution of "modern" studies, which forms an interesting thread in his narrative. To the three "powers" which have left an impress on Western education may be added a fourth —the pressure of demands for practical training in a broad sense, which finds an early illustration in the antithesis between the "education of chivalry" and the breeding (in school and university) of clerks and "scolares." The transition to modern phases of the problem is suggested in passages dealing with the new philosophy, the claims of the "man of action" which found expression in sixteenth and seventeenth century schemes for aristocratic academies, and the growing influence of the middle and commercial classes, whose private schools have a longer and more instructive history than is generally recognized.

The special merit of the work is the skilful manner in which the author traces the continuity of different forms of organized education in successive epochs and their gradual transformation in response to new influences and conditions. This applies more especially to his descriptions of universities and higher secondary schools. Without concealing their defects he makes it possible to understand how they survived through periods of apparent stagnation and the extent to which reform came from within, and to compare in some measure the work of quasi-public institutions with the results of private enterprise.

In the last chapter, describing the approach to a national system of education since 1870, we may attribute perhaps to the weariness of a conscientious historian certain abrupt transitions which render it difficult to catch the drift at the first reading, and also the somewhat allusive character of his paragraphs dealing with University Extension. Some inner knowledge is required if one is to appreciate the distinction between two kinds of tutorial class suggested on p. 329 by the neat trick of printing the second in capitals. If Professor Adamson were writing two hundred years hence, he would perhaps make more of adult education. He might even discover the existence of public libraries and mention them as institutions characteristic of this primitive age. We hope they will not punish his oversight by boycotting a book which at present stands without a rival.

A. E. Dobbs.

---

The Valley of Vision with a Preface by the Bishop of Edinburgh. Methuen and Co. 3s. 6d. net.

This is an age when "young men see visions and old men dream dreams," some weird and fanciful, and others deep and spiritual. The vapourings of spiritists, so-called messages from souls in Paradise, the avings of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the visions of the unseen world a

recorded by the Lancashire vicar Mr. Vale Owen, the triumphs of mediums, are peculiar phenomena of the present time. Far removed are these from the visions of the old mystics or from the record of things seen and experienced in the spiritual world contained in this little book. It is the work of a Sister of the Scottish Church, and the Bishop of Edinburgh in his preface writes: "The other life seems so far from many who desire it that it is well that, whether from the Evangelical or the Sacramental side of the Christian Faith, some echoes of its sounds and sights should reach us." The writer, earnest, devout, and spiritual, is akin to the mystics of former days. By the gift of the Holy Spirit, she says, the things of the Kingdom of Heaven are shown to her for a moment. Just for that moment she knows the truth surpassing her human understanding. And very beautiful are her reveries. They seem to come to her chiefly when she is engaged in spiritual exercises at the time of the Holy Eucharist. Some are quite simple, too slight almost to be set down in print; others rise to spiritual heights of mystic vision. A young priest dies. Afterwards he appears to her and communicates her. Hence she learns the continuance of avocations in the future life, and that he is a "priest for ever." Most readers will agree with the Bishop when he cautiously writes: "The book contains so many passages of spiritual beauty that none who peruse it will do so without feeling the better, even though they may not agree with all that is written."

P. H. DITCHFIELD.

---

THE DELIGHTFUL JOYS OF HEAVEN. By Miss Evelyn Peacock, M.B.E. London: S.P.C.K. 1920. Vol. I. Pp. vi+149. 6s. 6d. net.

The authoress of this book believes that though most people profess to desire the "delightful joys of heaven" after death, they would be hard put to it to give a detailed account of what they expect. Heaven is not to them, as it should be, "an alluring prospect of thrilling joys." This book sets out three causes of this indefiniteness: (1) The widespread idea that everything will be changed by death; (2) neglect of careful study of the Bible passages dealing with the future life; (3) the fear that an absorbing interest in the life to come may unfit a man for usefulness here. To combat these three causes is the purpose of this book. The authoress states her belief that the joys of heaven are an accentuation of the joys of earth, and that each soul on passing to heaven will find an opportunity of enjoying to the fullest possible extent those very things which brought him the greatest delight in his earthly life. Thus the athlete will know the joy of unimpeded motion, the scholar will taste the delights of knowledge, the musician will hear the most perfect harmonies, and the poets, labourers, physicians, artists—indeed, all sorts and conditions of men—will taste the fullness of joy in the perfection of their own occupations, talents, and arts. The authoress turns to the Bible for proof of her case; but her method of using the Scriptures lays her open to a certain amount of criticism. The day of "proof-texts" is over, and the Bible is read and studied to-day from a different angle. Her method in this particular instance does not matter much, for her theories are well attested by the whole teaching of the Christian faith; but a more convincing argument might have been made had the Bible been used in a less antiquated fashion. The book is full of charm from a literary standpoint, and full of delight as an apologetic. If it only serves to remove the secret dread of death from the minds of its readers it will not have been written in vain. But it should accomplish a more positive result than that, and ought to lead the reader to echo the Apostle's words that, though life is a desirable thing on earth, to depart and be with Christ is much better.

H. L. HUBBARD.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER